ANSWER

TO

George Keith's

NARRATIVE

OF HIS

Proceedings at *Turners-Hall*,

On the 11th of the Month called *June*, 1696.

WHEREIN

His CHARGES against divers of the People called

QUAKERS

(Both in that, and in another Book of his,

CALLED,

Gross Error & Hypocrisie Detected)

Are fairly Considered, Examined, and Refuted.

By *THOMAS ELLWOOD*.

London: Printed and Sold by *T. Sowle* near, the *Meeting-House* in *White-Hart-Court* in *Gracious-street* 1696.

AN

ANSVVER

TO

George Keith's NARRATIVE, &c.

IT is not ſurely, without good Reaſon, that the Church of Chriſt, here on Earth, is called the Church *Militant*: For (beſides the *inward* and ſpiritual Enemies, which her ſeveral Members have to encounter with, in their Pilgrimage through this troubleſome World) ſuch hath been, and is, her Lot and Portion, that ſhe hath rarely been free from *outward* Enemies of one kind or other; her great Adverſary, *Satan*, continually raiſing up ſome evil Inſtruments or other, to fall upon her, all aiming at her Ruine, though after divers Ways and Manners. Sometimes the Civil Powers, under which ſhe hath lived, have been ſtirred up to *proclaim* as it were, *open War againſt her*; and to inflict ſevere and heavy *Penalties* upon her, for her faithful adherence to her Lord and Maſter, Chriſt Jeſus. When, through *Faith* and *Patience*, ſhe hath overcome, and the Wrath and Fury of Men hath been aſſwaged, ſo that ſhe hath had ſome reſpit from thoſe outward Sufferings: Then hath her old Adverſary

(the common Enemy of Mankind) beſtirr'd himſelf in another way, to raiſe up *Perſecution* againſt her of *another kind*, by inſtigating ſome or other (either ſuch as were always avowed Enemies to her, or ſuch as for ſome time appeared to be of her, but by *the ſweep of his Tail* had been ſtruck off from her) to ſpeak or write againſt her, falſly to accuſe her, and load her with the foulest Reproaches, and moſt infamous Slanders and Scandals; that by ſo miſrepreſenting her, they might hinder others from joyning to, or favouring her, and ſtir up the Civil Magiſtrate again, to perſecute her afreſh. This hath been the Lot, this the Condition of the *little Flock* of Chriſt, in former Ages, as Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtories declare. As for the preſent Age, and with reſpect to the People called Quakers (whom God by an Inviſible Arm of Power hath raiſed up, and held up, and made a *peculiar* People to himſelf) Experience gives ſufficient Proof, the matter being yet freſh in Memory. For (not to look back ſo far as that which was called the *Commonwealth's* Time, wherein many of the leading Men, in moſt Profeſſions, put forth their utmoſt Strength againſt us, both in *Preaching* and *Printing*, raiſing thoſe *falſe Reports* concerning us, and charging many *falſe Accuſations* upon us, with reſpect both to *Doctrine* and *Practice*, which others of our Adverſaries, that followed after, have taken up *upon Truſt* from them) no ſooner was that great Perſecution a little abated (which ſoon after the Reſtoration of K. *Charles* the Second, through the fault of *ſome Diſſenters*, fell upon *All*, but moſt heavily upon *Us*) and that a little Calm and Quiet enſued; but out came ſeveral Books againſt us, written by ſome of thoſe Profeſſors, who either in ſome Meaſure did ſuffer, or (if they had been faithful to their own Principle) ſhould have ſuffered in the ſame ſtorm with us. By that Time the Duſt, which thoſe Books had *raiſed*, was *laid* by our

An-

Anſwers thereunto, a freſh *Perſecution* from the Government aroſe, upon the *Informing Act*, the main weight of which, it is well known, fell upon us; they who before, and afterwards, aſſaulted us in Print, finding Ways then to hide, and ſave themſelves from Suffering. But when that Storm was a little over, out they came again, and in divers Books, written by *Faldo*, *Hicks*, and others, heaped up many wrong Charges, Defamations, Slanders and falſe Accuſations againſt us; all which were refuted, and wiped off in our Books, Printed in Anſwer thereunto: Nor have thoſe of other Profeſſions been ſo forward to attaque us ſince. But *now*, that Liberty of Conſcience, in the free Exerciſe of Religious Worſhip, is by Authority granted, and thereby outward Sufferings in a great meaſure abated; our old Enemy, envying us ſo great a Benefit (though but in common with others) hath contrived ways and means to raiſe a *new War* againſt us; by ſtirring up ſome, who have formerly walked with us, and for ſometime profeſſed to be of us (but upon ſome peeviſh Diſcontent or other, have turned aſide and left us) to turn now againſt us, and oppoſe us, and to pour forth *Floods of Reproach*, ſlander and falſe Accuſations upon us. His chief Agent, at preſent, in this Work, is **George Keith**, a Scotchman, whoſe *ambitious Aims* not being anſwered, nor his *abſurd and fantaſtical Notions* received; by and amongſt the People called Quakers, he is now become, of a ſeeming Friend, a *real* Enemy. He having publiſhed many Books againſt us, and in defence of thoſe Books wrangled with us for a while in Print, till he found himſelf too cloſely pinched, to be able to give an Anſwer fit to be ſeen in Print, hath at length bethought himſelf of a *Wile* to excuſe himſelf from anſwering, which was, to ſet up a kind of *Judicial Court*, of his *own Head*, and by his *own Authority*, in a Place at his *own Command*, on a Day of his *own Appointing*, there

to Charge and Try divers of us who are called Quakers, whether present or absent, concerning matters of Faith and Doctrine; and that the rude Multitude might not be wanting to his Assistance there, he gave publick notice of it sometime before, by an Advertisement in Print, and therein a *sort of Summons* to some of us by Name, to others by Designation, to be present. This *Arbitrary* Proceeding, and *Usurped* Authority, as we judged it unreasonable in him to impose, so we did not think fit to submit to, or own; and therefore forbore to appear at the Time and Place by him appointed. Yet lest any whom he should draw thither, might mistake the Cause of our not appearing, the Reasons thereof, drawn up in short Heads, were sent thither to be read, and given among the People, which they were. However, according to his before declared Intention, to proceed whether any of us were there or no, he, being *Judge in his own Court*, over-ruled our Reasons, and went on to Arraign, and Convict us Absent. The *Pageantry* of which days Work, as *acted* there by himself, he hath since Published, with his Name to it, under the Title of *An exact Narrative of the Proceedings at* Turners-*Hall*, &c. *Together with the Disputes and Speeches there between* G. Keith *and other Quakers, differing from him in some Religious Principles.* How idle is this in him, to pretend in his Title to give an Account of Disputes and Speeches between him and other Quakers, whenas his Narrative it self gives no account of any Dispute there, nor any thing like it, and of that little that was said by any of those few Quakers, that were present, most was to the People (tending to shew them the unreasonableness of his undertaking, and desiring them to reserve one Ear for the other side) very little of it to him.

Before the Narrative, he hath Reprinted his former *Advertisement*, by which he gave Notice of his intend

ed

ed Meeting. Now in as much as he hath done ſo, why did he not alſo Print with it the *Reaſons* given for our not Meeting him then and there, that the Reader might have judged of the ſufficiency of them? In this *G. Keith* hath not been juſt either to the Reader or to us. He that pretends to give an *exact Narrative* of a thing, ought to do ſo, as well as ſay ſo. And whatſoever was in that Meeting communicated to the Hearer, ought to be in like manner communicated to the Reader, if a Narrative of the Proceedings thereof be made, otherwiſe ſuch Narrative is *not exact*. Now he acknowledges that ſuch Reaſons were offered, and *Read*; for he ſays, p. 13. *At the opening of the Meeting, when* G. Keith *ſtood up to make ſome Introductory Speech, to give an Account of the occaſion of the Meeting*, H. Goldney, *with ſome other Quakers of* W. Penn's *Party, came with a Printed Paper, giving ſome Reaſons why* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead *did not appear, which he deſired might be Read.* Then adds, *It was readily granted, and the Reaſons why* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead *did not appear, were Read by* G. Keith. This made thoſe Reaſons part of the Proceedings of that Meeting, and therefore they ought to have been Publiſhed in the Narrative, that where-ever that had been read, they might have been read with it. The blame for this falls upon him, in as much as he acknowledges, in his Title Page, *the whole* to have been *Publiſhed and Reviſed* (inſtead of Reviſed and then Publiſhed) *by him.* And this ſhews his *partial Dealing*, and how willing he was to keep his Reader in the dark as to any thing that made againſt him. However, that I may give my Reader that Information and Satisfaction, which he hath with-held from his, I here inſert thoſe Reaſons, as followeth.

to Charge and Try divers of us who are called Quakers, whether preſent or abſent, concerning matters of Faith and Doctrine; and that the rude Multitude might not be wanting to his Aſſiſtance there, he gave publick notice of it ſometime before, by an Advertiſement in Print, and therein a *ſort of Summons* to ſome of us by Name, to others by Deſignation, to be preſent. This *Arbitrary* Proceeding, and *Uſurped* Authority, as we judged it unreaſonable in him to impoſe, ſo we did not think fit to ſubmit to, or own; and therefore forbore to appear at the Time and Place by him appointed. Yet leſt any whom he ſhould draw thither, might miſtake the Cauſe of our not appearing, the Reaſons thereof, drawn up in ſhort Heads, were ſent thither to be read, and given among the People, which they were. However, according to his before declared Intention, to proceed whether any of us were there or no, he, being *Judge in his own Court*, over-ruled our Reaſons, and went on to Arraign, and Convict us Abſent. The *Pageantry* of which days Work, as *acted* there by himſelf, he hath ſince Publiſhed, with his Name to it, under the Title of *An exact Narrative of the Proceedings at* Turners-*Hall*, &c. *Together with the Diſputes and Speeches there between* G. Keith *and other Quakers, differing from him in ſome Religious Principles.* How idle is this in him, to pretend in his Title to give an Account of Diſputes and Speeches between him and other Quakers, whenas his Narrative it ſelf gives no account of any Diſpute there, nor any thing like it, and of that little that was ſaid by any of thoſe few Quakers, that were preſent, moſt was to the People (tending to ſhew them the unreaſonableneſs of his undertaking, and deſiring them to reſerve one Ear for the other ſide) very little of it to him.

Before the Narrative, he hath Reprinted his former *Advertiſement*, by which he gave Notice of his intend

ed

ed Meeting. Now in as much as he hath done ſo, why did he not alſo Print with it the *Reaſons* given for our not Meeting him then and there, that the Reader might have judged of the ſufficiency of them? In this *G. Keith* hath not been juſt either to the Reader or to us. He that protends to give an *exact Narrative* of a thing, ought to do ſo, as well as ſay ſo. And whatſoever was in that Meeting communicated to the Hearer, ought to be in like manner communicated to the Reader, if a Narrative of the Proceedings thereof be made, otherwiſe ſuch Narrative is *not exact*. Now he acknowledges that ſuch Reaſons were offered, and *Read*; for he ſays, p. 13. *At the opening of the Meeting, when* G. Keith *ſtood up to make ſome Introductory Speech, to give an Account of the occaſion of the Meeting,* H. Goldney, *with ſome other Quakers of* W. Penn's *Party, came with a Printed Paper, giving ſome Reaſons why* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead *did not appear, which he deſired might be Read.* Then adds, *It was readily granted, and the Reaſons why* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead *did not appear, were Read by* G. Keith. This made thoſe Reaſons part of the Proceedings of that Meeting, and therefore they ought to have been Publiſhed in the Narrative, that where-ever that had been read, they might have been read with it. The blame for this falls upon him, in as much as he acknowledges, in his Title Page, *the whole* to have been *Publiſhed and Reviſed* (inſtead of Reviſed and then Publiſhed) *by him.* And this ſhews his *partial Dealing*, and how willing he was to keep his Reader in the dark as to any thing that made againſt him. However, that I may give my Reader that Information and Satisfaction, which he hath with-held from his, I here inſert thoſe Reaſons, as followeth.

REASONS, *why those of the People called* Quakers, *challenged by* George Keith, *to meet him at* Turners *Hall the Eleventh of this Month called* June, 1696. *refuse their Appearance at his Peremptory Summons.*

'WHereas *G. Keith* hath, after his wonted irregular and unruly Manner, Challeng'd divers of us 'to defend our selves against such Charges as he has to 'exhibite against us at *Turners* Hall: These are to Certifie all whom it may Concern, That the *Reasons* why 'we decline any such Meeting, are as follow.

'1. Because the said *G. Keith* has given us such frequent Proofs of his very Passionate and Abusive Behaviour, at the many more Select Meetings we have had 'with him, in all Manner of Sweetness, long Suffering 'and Patience, on our side, to satisfie, and preserve 'him from these Extreams: That we cannot assure our 'selves now of any better Entertainment, or that the 'Meeting can have any desirable Success, for a through 'Information.

'2. We decline to Meet, because it is not an agreed 'Meeting on both sides, which it ought to have been; 'and where that is not, or cannot be adjusted; the 'Press is the next fair Way and Expedient, which he 'has began with, and now seems to decline; nor hath 'he sent us a Copy of his Charge or Indictment against 'us, which also he ought to have done.

'3. That he has two of our Books which lie hard at 'his Door; in Vindication of us and our Doctrines from 'his Exceptions, and which he has not yet answered; 'so that he is not upon equal Terms with us; and therefore we think his Challenge, *Appointment* and *Summons* unfair; and that all that are not partial will be 'of the same Mind with us.

'4 Such

'4. Such *publick* and *unlimited* Meetings are too often attended with *Heats*, *Levity* and *Confusion*, and 'answer not the End desired by sober and enquiring 'Men. Besides, that it lets up a Practise that Authority may Judge to be an *Abuse* to our Liberty, and 'so draw that under Reflection, as no Friend to the 'Civil Peace.

'5. We know not what Religion or Perswasion this '*Wavering* Man is of, or what Church or People he adheres to, or will receive him, with his *vain Speculations*, that have led him to desert us; nor who are accountable to us for him and his *Irregularities* and *Abuses*; the generality of such Assemblies usually making 'ill Auditors, worse Judges, and no good Security for 'our Satisfaction. And we must therefore take leave 'to say, it seems to us an indirect way of *disquieting* 'and *invading* our present Liberty, that *so Irreligious a* '*Meeting should be held, whose End is to abuse other Men* '*for their Religion.* If this should be *imitated* by all the 'several sorts of different Perswasions in this City, 'what Heaps and Confusions must necessarily ensue!

'6. Wherefore Lastly, Be it known unto all, That '*for the sake of Religion, the Liberty granted us, and the* '*Civil Peace*, we decline to Meet him; and not from 'any apprehensions we have of his Abilities, or our own 'consciousness of Error, or Injustice to the said *G.* '*Keith*, whose weak and unbridled Temper we know 'is such, that what Learning and Parts he hath, have 'not been able to ballance and support him on less occasions, so that we may say they are in ill hands; and if 'he proceeds as he begins, they will be employed to an 'ill End, which his (poor Man!) cannot but be, unless 'he change his Course; which we heartily pray for, that 'a place of Repentance he may find; and thro' a true 'Contrition, the Remission of his great Sin of Envy, 'and evilly Intreating the Lords People and Way, which

'we

'we profeſs, and which he the ſaid *G. Keith* hath long 'and lately both profeſſed, and zealouſly vindicated, 'as ſuch.

What weight there is in theſe Reaſons, I leave the Reader to Judge. *G. Keith*, in his Pref. ſays, p. 7. They *are ſo Frivolous and Weak, that they are ſcarce worth noting.* And in Nar. p. 13. *The Reaſons are ſo ſlender, that I hope every Judicious Perſon here can anſwer them*, and he pretends (Pref. p. 7.) that he did anſwer the Chiefeſt of them on the Place, and refers to the Narrative for it. How Slender, Weak, and Frivolous, his Anſwers were, appears by the Narrative, in which he ſays *little* to the Reaſons; and that *little*, as *little* to the purpoſe. To the Firſt he ſays, Nar. p. 13. *If I am ſuch an angry Perſon as they repreſent me, I ſhall lay my Self the more Open, and they ſhall have the greater advantage*; *you know well enough*, ſays he, *that they would be glad of any advantage againſt me.* How could thoſe Auditors know this, when it is falſe in it ſelf? We would not be glad of *any* Advantage againſt him, eſpecially not of ſuch an advantage as ſhould ariſe from his *Intemperate* Tongue, and rude Behaviour: We have had too much of that kind of advantage againſt him already, at other Meetings we have had with him, when there was more Reaſon to have expected *Sobriety* and *Temper* from him, than there is now. Had he as publickly Renounced the profeſſion and name of *Quaker*, as he hath plainly departed from the Spirit and Life of Jeſus, in which the People called *Quakers* Live and Walk (and in ſome meaſure of which he once Walked with them) we might have been the ſooner induced to have met him, as an *Open* and *Profeſſed Adverſary* to us, our Principles and Profeſſion. But ſince, to do us the greater deſpite, tho' he be gone from us in Spirit and Mind, and hath Openly ſeparated from us in Worſhip, and hath been alſo diſowned by us, he chooſes yet to retain the ſame name,

and

and make a pretence to the ſame Profeſſion with us, (both the Title of his Narrative pretending to relate Diſputes between *G. Keith*, and other Quakers, implying himſelf to be one, and he expreſly ſaying, p. 31. l. 15. *I am a Quaker ſtill*:) We were not willing, nor are, to give, or admit an occaſion for him to expoſe our Profeſſion (how unjuſtly ſoever) to the Cenſure and Contempt of the Inconſiderate and Undiſcerning Multitude, by his *unruly Paſſions and Rudeneſs*, which we had reaſon from our frequent experience of him, to expect would break forth, if we were there to oppoſe him. Nor do we think that any Advantage which could have been made of it, could have made amends for the diſadvantage that might have enſued, if he thereby ſhould have raiſed an *Hurly Burly*, or *Tumult* among the People.

To the Fourth, (for he ſeldom keeps method) which had reſpect to *Civil Authority* and the Publick *Peace*, he only ſays, he had the *Lord Mayor's Leave, who ſent his Marſhal to preſerve the Peace, and therefore there can be nothing in that.* But, beſides that he gave no notice in his Advertiſement, that he had the Mayors Leave, (which renders it ſuſpected that he had not askt the Mayor's Leave, till after he had Publiſhed his Advertiſement) not only we, but others (as judicious perhaps as himſelf, & more immediately concerned in the Security of the publick Peace) Conſidering the preſent ſtate of things, the Kings abſence, and the great diſcontent which many, eſpecially of the Lower Rank of People, are under, by reaſon of want of Trade (occaſion'd by the preſent Scarcity of Currant Money) did think there might be more of danger in that, than was fit to be hazarded on ſo needleſs an Occaſion. For if, upon the Invitation given a *Month before*; but a few Thouſands of Diſcontented (and ſome, perhaps, not very well affected) Perſons, ſhould have got together

and

and *taken head*, they might ſoon have Increaſed to greater numbers and ſtrength, than the City Marſhal (how ſufficient ſoever to his Office) might have been able to diſperſe. The number of Reaſons in our Paper is Six. He has given theſe *Slender Weak* and *Frivolous* Anſwers to two of them; and ſays, *This is enough at preſent to anſwer this Paper*, Nar. P. 13. Yet four lines after, in the ſame page, bethinking himſelf further of it, he adds, *They ſay, I did not exhibit to them a Copy of my Charge againſt them* (an Indictment they call it, *they would repreſent me as a man ſetting up a Spiritual Court*) *but my Printed Paper ſays*, W. Penn, *and* G. Whitehead, *are juſtly deſired to be preſent. This*, ſays he, *is no Indictment nor Summons, as they falſely call it.* 'Tis true, the word [Summons] is not *uſed*, but the nature of a Summons is *implied*. He did not indeed expreſly ſay, They are *required* to be preſent, but uſed the word [*Deſired*] But it is a deſire *Sub pœna* (as I may ſay) for he backs it with a *Declaration of his full Intention*, to proceed againſt them, if they ſhall not be preſent; ſo that if they ſtay away, be it at their *Peril*, of being Calumniated and Traduced behind their backs. Whether he will call his Meeting a *Spiritual* Court, or a *Temporal*, let him chooſe: Certain it is, that a *Juriſdiction* he *uſurped*, not belonging to him, over ſuch as he had no Power over. And after what manner he intended to have received and treated us, if we had been there, may well be gathered from what his Narrative ſays he ſpake about the cloſe of that Meeting, and what he hath added in his Preface ſince. That in the Nar. is in p. 50. where he thus ſays, *I am perſwaded the Reaſons given in the Paper, read at the beginning, were no juſt reaſon for their not appearing. But though ſome Compariſons are Odious, yet give me leave to make a Compariſon. May a Malefactor make this excuſe, You ſhall not call me before a Juſtice without my conſent? If a Man Robb me, I may Complain of him as a Robber, and*

without

without his consent call him to account. But here is a strange thing, Injuring Men may not be called to account without their consent, it will trespass against the Law, and intrenches upon Liberty of Conscience: Judge now, Reader, by the Comparison he hath made, Whether we have done him any wrong in calling his *Advertisement* a *Summons*, his *Charge* an *Indictment*. He compares us to *Malefactors*; But *Malefactors* do not use to be *desired* to appear, but *Summoned*, *Required*, Commanded at least, if not *Compelled*; and *Indicted* when they do appear. Had not we been finely holpen up (as they say) if we had been there, only to have stood there as *Malefactors*, to have *Pleaded our Cause* before *Judge Keith* and his *Associates*, the *Mobb*, and I know not whom else? Tho' he spake not so plain in his Advertisement, as he hath done since, yet there was enough in that to give us to understand what entertainment we were to expect there. There was nothing like *Equality* proposed in it, nothing of *Indifferency*; no liberty reserved to us, to *charge him*, if we saw meet, as well as he us. No, no, the *Scene was laid* only for us to hear our selves Charged and *proved Guilty* (for that we should be proved Guilty, was, it seemes, determined beforehand) And to what end then was it offered, that we should be *freely heard*, to answer to our *several Charges*? This was *worse dealing* than is used towards *Malefactors*. For when they are Summoned to hear themselves Charged, they have full Liberty given them, not only to Answer for themselves, but to *Object* (if they have cause) against their *Accuser*, against his *Witnesses*, Yea, and against the *Jury* too. But they are not called to hear themselves *proved Guilty*; (as it seemes we were) whether they shall be proved *Guilty* or *not Guilty*, is left upon the *Issue* of their *Tryal*: But in our Case, it was resolved before hand; We were called thither to hear *our selves Charged, and proved Guilty*. Now though G.

Keith's

Keith's *Malefactory* Compariſon ſhews his both *Envy* and *Folly* in making it, yet it anſwers not his caſe. For although a Malefactor may not ſay, *You ſhall not call me before a Juſtice without my conſent:* Yet I fancy a Malefactor might ſay, *You ſhall not make your Self a Juſtice*, and then call me before your ſelf, without my conſent. Neither ſhall you call me, without my conſent, before any Man elſe; that is no otherwiſe a Juſtice, than of your *making*, till I better underſtand your Power for making Juſtices. No wonder this *little* Man ſpeaks ſo *Bigg*, if he hath entertained a Notion, that he hath Power not only to convene Perſons, at his pleaſure, before himſelf; but alſo to confer *Juſticiary Authority* on ſuch others as ſhall aſſemble on his Advertiſement. He threatens, if he be not humoured, to repeat his Advertiſement. If he ſhould do ſo, ſuch as are ambitious of ſuch an Imployment, may haſten to *Turners-Hall*, if they would be made *Juſtices* by *G. Keith*. He purſues his Compariſon further, ſaying, ib. *If a man Rob me, I may complain of him as a Robber, and without his conſent, call him to an Account.* He may ſo, but he muſt complain then, *coram competenti Judice*, Before one that hath a juſt Authority over him: For if he complain *coram non Judice*, Before one that hath nothing to do with it, he may go as he came, *without Redreſs*. In his Pref. p. 8. he ſaith, *And as Inſignificant is their Excuſe of declining to meet, becauſe it was not an agreed Meeting on both ſides: As if Guilty Perſons are not to be tried without their Conſent and Agreement.* Obſerve here, he reputes us *Guilty firſt*, and talks of *Trying us afterwards*. What elſe is this, but to condemn firſt, and try after? As if (ſays he) Guilty perſons are not to be tried without their conſent. When Perſons are pronounced *Guilty*, it is to be ſuppoſed, they have had *Trial*: For it is from a *Trial* and *Conviction* that they are Denominated *Guilty*. The Law calls no Man *Guilty*, until upon due *Trial*, he be proved

and

and found *Guilty*. Till then the Law ſuppoſes him *Innocent*. If a man be juſtly ſuſpected of any Crime, he may and ought be fairly *tried*, in a due and right Method, that it may appear whether he be *Guilty* or *Innocent*. But none I hope, except *G. Keith*, is ſo weak to think, that any one who hath a mind to it, may take upon him to try ſuch a man, and paſs Sentence on him. He adds there, *Their upbraiding me by Inſinuating my aſſuming a Spiritual Juriſdiction over them, and Summoning them to appear before me, is Idle and Vain. The Injurer is Debtor to the Injured, and Accountable to him.* Tho' his repreſenting us to be the Injurers, and himſelf the Injured, is but *precarious*, and a *begging of the Queſtion*, which we deny: Yet his urging, that the Injurer is Debtor to the Injured, and accountable to him, in Juſtification of his appointing a Meeting for us to appear at, doth imply he aſſumed a *Juriſdiction* over us, & thought he might *Summon* us to appear, which was Idle and Vain in him to think, much more to do. What ſhould induce him to think ſo highly of himſelf, and take ſo much upon him, I know not, unleſs he hath ſome little *Eccleſiaſtical Preferment* in the Wind; which if he has, perhaps it may never riſe higher than an *Apparitor*, or ſome ſuch ſmall Officer.

But he ſays, ib. *Let them tell me what Spiritual Juriſdiction they had over me, to call me ſeveral times to them at their Yearly-Meeting*, 1694. *more than I had over them, to call them to our Meeting at Turners-Hall*, 1696, *unleſs they will fly to their common Pretence, common to them with the Church of* Rome, *their Infallibility*? Firſt let me tell him, His Contempt of, and Scoff at *Infallibility* (aſſerted and maintained by himſelf in his Book of *Immediate Revelation not ceaſed*, p. 36, 37, 38. Second Edition, 1676.) is an Infallible Proof of his *Apoſtacy*. Next I'll tell him (ſeeing he asks it) what Power we had then, to call him, more than he hath now, to

call

call us. Every Religious Society or Body, hath a certain Power within it self over the particular *Members* that make up, or pretend to be of, that Society or Body; by vertue of which, such Society or Body may call to account, deal with, and (if they see cause) deny any such Member as shall walk disorderly, contrary to the Rules, and against the Safety or Honour of the Society. Now *G. Keith*, knows full well, that at the time he mentions, in 1694. he pretended to be a Member of our Society, and thrust himself amongst us, and upon us, which gave us Right to deal with him as we did. But since the the time he was disowned by us, as one gone out from us, we never pretended to fellowship with him, or to be Members of, or any way related to, that Society he is of (if indeed he be of any.) And therefore he has not the like ground to call us to his Meeting (which we were never of, but against) as we then had to call him to our Meeting, which he then pretended, and professed to be of.

He asks, p. 7. *Why should Disputes* viva voce, *be more offensive to civil Peace, than Disputes in Print. I believe* (says he) *they can give no Reason.* I believe I have given a Reason already, and that Demonstrative too. He might as well ask, Why should the gathering together of many Hundreds, or thousands, of Men, in a time of Faction and great Discontents, be more offensive to civil Peace, than People's Reading Books, privately in their Houses or Closets? I believe if he cannot, (because he will not) every body else can see the Reason.

From our not answering him, *viva voce*, he is willing to infer that we should not answer him in Print neither. For he says, ib. *If I be not worthy, nor fit to be answered by word, nor am I to be answered by writ.* It is not his *worthiness* that Inclines us to Answer him at all; but the defence and clearing of our Principles, and our selves, from his *Calumnies* and false *Accusations*. In doing which

we

we think not our ſelves obliged to follow his Direction; or to alter our Courſe, as oft as he is driven to alter his. When he was in *Penſilvania*, where he was anſwered *viva voce*, (and indeed could not well be anſwered otherwiſe, the only Preſs in thoſe Parts being then at his command) he *voided* Books, againſt his Opponents there, thick and threefold, (as the ſaying is.) He complained not then of lack, either of Time to Write, or outward Ability to Print, but *conceived* and *brought forth* Book upon Book, as faſt, in a manner, as the Preſs could *deliver* him. When he came firſt over hither, if any one diſpleaſed him, his ordinary Threat was, *I'll put thee in Print*. And it was not long before he fell to Printing here, and ran on for ſome time, as if he would have driven down all before him. But having undertaken an *Evil Cauſe*, he quickly found himſelf unable to maintain it, or defend himſelf; and that hath made him weary of Printing, becauſe indeed he cannot anſwer what lies upon him already in Print. And becauſe he is not willing to own that, nor would be thought to be *driven out of the Preſs*, he now pretends *want of Time and Money* to Print with; and in his Advertiſement gave that as his Reaſon why he declined Printing, and appointed a Meeting to *talk out* his matter by word of Mouth. But that that was but a falſe pretence, is evident; for it appears by his *Narrative*, that he intended, after he had got ſuch a Meeting, to fall to Printing again: For he ſays, p. 24. *If I wrong the Quotation, it will appear in Print, for we intend that the Quotations ſhall be Printed.* This ſhews his *deſign* was not ſo much to *ſhun Printing*, as to *ſhun Anſwering* our former Books, by ſhifting the Controverſie into another Courſe. For as ſoon as that Meeting of his was over, he (or ſome body for him) could find Time and Money too, to publiſh a *Narrative* of what he pretends to have delivered then, with large *Additions* to it, a Book of 12 *d.* price, and the biggeſt, I think that he hath Printed, ſince

he came last to *England*, and yet hath left our Books unanswered. Whereas, had he been able to have answered at all *to the purpose*, and to have cleared himself of what is therein charged upon him, a *less Book*, and of *less Price*, than the *Narrative* he has now published, might have done his business. But it is evident he did not want Time, so much as he wanted Truth on his side; And that he did not so much want outward Ability to Print, as inward Ability to Defend himself, and the Cause he had undertaken. And indeed, as to his pretence of want of outward Ability to Print, seeing he sold his own Books, one might reasonably think, he should rather be inabled than disabled by that. But if it be true, that he says in his *Narrative*, p. 50. *That he hath weakened his Estate by Printing*, it is the Effect of his own *Folly* and *Wickedness*, in Printing *false* and *frivolous* matters: For he might probably have rather *encreas'd* his Estate by Printing, selling his Books as he has done, had he written matter worth the Reading. But if want of Time and Money, for Writing and Printing, had been the real Cause of his not Answering our Books, how comes he to be so flush of Both now; that, since the publishing his Narrative, he could find both Time to write, and Money to Print another pretty large Book against us, leaving my two former Books yet unanswered? Has he sprung a Mine at *Turners-Hall*? Or have some of his Auditors made a Gathering for him, to put him in stock, to go on with his Work of fighting against God and his People?

To our Objection, That he did not exhibit to us a Copy of his Charge (or Indictment) against us, he says, Narr. p. 14. *And for the Particulars I intend to prove against them, they were expresly mentioned in my Advertisement, containing four Foundamental Doctrines of Christianity by them opposed.* This is not true, as will appear by consulting the Advertisement. In the first head of it, relating to *W. Penn*,

Penn, Nar. p 9. he ſaith, *I charge him to be guilty of falſe Accuſation and Defamation, and offer to prove him to be ſo; As alſo I offer to prove him guilty out of his printed Books*, (but names no Book) *of moſt Erroneous and Hurtful Principles, contrary to the Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith and Religion*, &c. (but names no particular Principle) *and alſo that he is guilty of groſs contradiction to himſelf.* (But ſays not wherein.)

In his ſecond Head, relating to me, He *charges me to be guilty of falſe Accuſations, Perverſions and Forgeries, contained in ſundry defamatory Books printed againſt him.* (But ſhews not wherein.) *As alſo of moſt Erroneous and Hurtful Principles.* (But names no particular Principle.)

In his third Head, relating to *G. Whitehead*, he *offers to prove* G. Whitehead, *out of ſome of his printed Books* (but names no Book) *guilty of moſt Erroneous and Hurtful Principles*, &c. but names no particular Principle. This is all in *general*, both as to *Books* and *Principles*; no one Principle, nor any one Book, particularly mentioned. Yet in his *Narrative*, he ſays, The *Particulars* I intend to prove againſt them, were *expreſly* mention'd in my printed Paper called *An Advertiſement*, containing four Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity by them oppoſed. After he had dated, ſigned, and thereby cloſed his Advertiſement, he added an account of the Cauſe of his intimating ſuch a Meeting. In that he ſays, *I appeal to all moderate Perſons, whether this my Intimation of ſuch a Meeting, in the Defence of the Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, as the neceſſity of Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered*, &c. *Juſtification and Sanctification, by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, The Reſurrection of the Body that dieth, and Chriſts coming without us*, &c. *All which I offer to prove have been Oppoſed and Contradicted by* Some *of them; be not juſtifiable*, &c. If this be the paſſage he refers to, wherein he ſays the Particulars he intended to prove againſt them, were *expreſly* mentioned, yet here

is nothing but *Uncertainty* ſtill: For here he only offers to prove that thoſe Fundamental Doctrines have been Oppoſed and Contradicted by *Some* of them, not by them *All*. He had ſummoned and charged *Four* Perſons by Name, and a *whole Meeting* beſides. He offers to prove that certain Fundamental Doctrines had been oppoſed by *Some* of them, but names not by which of them. How ſhould they, or any of them, know by this, which of them he intended to fix it on? How ſhould they ſeverally be prepared to make Defence, when they did not know which of them in particular ſhould be charged, what in particular ſhould be charged on each, and out of what particular Books the Charge would be drawn? No conſiderate Perſon, I ſuppoſe, could think, that Men *in their right Wits*, would appear on ſuch a Summons, or diſcourſe on ſuch *uneven Terms*. *If the Trumpet give an uncertain ſound, who ſhall prepare himſelf to the Battel?* If a Diſpute had been intended, no Man, that underſtands the Rules of Diſputation, would have engaged on ſuch *unequal*, unfair, uncertain, blind terms. Even in *Duelling*, he that gives the *Challenge*, doth withal give notice *what Weapon* he intends to uſe, and of *what length*; The Reaſon of which is obvious.

He ſays, *Pref.* p. 8. *They think ſuch a Meeting at* Turners-Hall, *is but in a Corner, and not in the face of the Nation* (and ſo I ſuppoſe will every one think, in compariſon with the Preſs.) *But* (adds he) *they are like to find it hath been ſo much in the face of the Nation, that many in the Nation will notice it.* Like enough, but *not without Printing*. For the *Advertiſement* that gave the firſt publick Notice of it, and was to beget the Expectation of it, and to draw People to it, *was Printed:* (as when a New Play is to be acted, printed Papers to give Notice of it, are ſpread abroad ſome time before.) And now ſince it is over, the *Narrative* of it is *Printed*, without which little Notice would have been taken of it. So that

after

after all, *he is fain to come to Printing again*, where we told him before-hand he muſt come, and where we knew we ſhould have a time to meet with him, and talk with him with *leſs danger* of Diſturbance, in a *more ſedate* and quiet manner, and before *more competent* Judges, than the *ſhouting Mobb* at *Turners-Hall*. (For twice in one page, *viz.* p.45. he ſays the *Auditory ſhouted*, and no wonder, conſidering what an Auditory it was, and how he acted the *Terræfilius* or *Prevaricator* (not to ſay *Merry-Andrew*) to ſtir them up thereto. What a ſort of Auditory he had got, how fit for his purpoſe, and how diſpoſed to his ſervice ſome of them were, may be gathered from the Account himſelf has given of them and their Behaviour, in his Narrative. For at the very opening of the Meeting, when the Paper giving ſome Reaſons for our not being there, was read, and *G. Keith* had ſaid, *I offer to anſwer to every one of the Reaſons, if you deſire it*; his eaſie Auditory immediately replied, *No, it is needleſs*. Nar. p.13. When a Friend of ours propoſed a moſt juſt and reaſonable thing, viz. *That the Scriptures urged againſt us by* G. Keith, *ſhould be read*, and introduced his Propoſal in ſuch ſoft and modeſt terms, as, *I beg a Favour*, *G. Keith* had an Auditory (or rather perhaps ſome ready prepared and diſpoſed in his Auditory) which he makes to anſwer, *There is no need, go on*. Nar. p.27. When *G. Keith* had told a ſtrange and improbable ſtory againſt three Perſons whom he called Quakers, concerning words which he ſaid they ſpake in the year 1678, (about 18 years ago) on purpoſe *to defame* both them and us, and did not name them, and thereupon a Friend of ours preſt earneſtly on him to name them, he had an Auditor ready to help him off, by ſaying, *He has done enough*, Nar. p.39. Nay, when *G. Keith* had read a paſſage out of a Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, and a Friend of ours, deſiring to know when that Book was writ, did thus modeſtly ſay, *If I might, I deſire to have liberty to ſpeak*; *When was the date of the Book?*

He was immediately thus taken up by the Auditors, *If you will undertake their Cauſe, you may ſpeak, otherwiſe not.* Nar. p. 15. Yet in p. 45. he had an Auditor at hand, who ſeeing him at a loſs, ſays, *G. Keith, I ſee you are almoſt ſpent, I will anſwer for you.* From theſe few inſtances the indifferent Reader may ſee, how *far from being indifferent* that Auditory was. And from the whole, I doubt not but it will appear, That *G. Keith* had *no Reaſon* to appoint that Meeting, and ſummon us to appear at it; That we had *good Reaſon* not to come there, and that he was very unfair and unjuſt to traduce and defame us there, behind our Backs; when he knew we did not ſhun him in the *moſt open* way of Trial, but *provoked* him to it. It is very idle therefore in him to inſinuate (as in his Pref. p. 7.) that *W. Penn has ſhown great Cowardice; and his Party charged, by not appearing at all;* Since as it is no ſign of want of Courage, in a Man that uſes the outward Sword, to refuſe *Scuffling* with his Antagoniſt *in a Chamber*, while he boldly offers to *meet him in the open Field:* So it can never be judged, by conſiderate Men, a token of Cowardice or Diffidence in us, to refuſe to meet a *Brawling* Adverſary in a *By-Place*, (eſpecially upon *unfair* terms) while we moſt *readily offer* to meet and engage him in the *moſt open*, free, and *clear way* of deciding Religious Controverſies, the *Preſs*, where he firſt began, as himſelf ſays, *Nar. p. 38. What* (ſays he) *is the laſt Remedy againſt Oppreſſion? Why Printing: Therefore I began.* And ſeeing *G. Keith* himſelf firſt *opened the Preſs* to this Controverſie, by falling upon us in Print, we needed not have given any other Anſwer to him, than he formerly gave to his and our Opponent, *Rob. Gordon*, in the like caſe, *viz.* 'Seeing thou cameſt forth in Print againſt us, 'though under a Cover) what ground hadſt thou to ex-'pect another way of Anſwering, than by Print? See his Poſtſcript to a Book called, *The Nature of Chriſtianity, in the true Light, Aſſerted*, p. 60. This was his Anſwer

ſwer to *Gordon*, and this might have been ſufficient from us to him. But becauſe we were willing to inform and ſatisfie others, we publiſhed the fore-going Reaſons, which I doubt not have given, and will give ſatisfaction to all diſ-intereſſed and impartial Perſons.

Now as to the *Errors* or falſe Doctrines, which he hath charged upon any of us, and which he pretended to prove againſt us, at his *irregular* Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, they being moſtly ſuch as not only he himſelf hath formerly held, maintained and defended, (while he was amongſt us) but hath ſince his departing from us charged before in Print upon ſome of us, and his Charge hath been already Anſwered and *Refuted* in Print, particularly in a Book of mine publiſhed the laſt year, called *Truth Defended*, which he hath never yet Replied to, (though he once made as if he would:) Although we might, with reaſon excuſe our ſelves, from giving any new Anſwer, until our former Anſwers, already given had been enervated (at leaſt replied to) by him, and only refer thereunto; yet for the ſake of others, whom he endeavours, by falſe Accuſations, to *prejudice* and harden againſt the holy Truth and Principles which we hold and profeſs: (Partly alſo, becauſe he hath added, in his Narrative, ſome few paſſages to his former Charge, to make it ſeem not wholly the ſame) I am content to follow him through his Narrative alſo (which comprehends another Book of his, called *Groſs Errors and Hypocriſie Detected*) and hope to manifeſt both that we are *ſound in the Faith* in thoſe very Particulars wherein he charges us to be *unſound*; and that he is *unjuſt*, envious and wicked, in his *falſely* accuſing us. Yet do I not intend hereby to acquit or diſcharge him from anſwering in Print, what Books already written lie at his door unanſwered; but rather to engage him the more to anſwer both the former and this alſo.

The Doctrines he ſets down, (*Nar.* p. 14.) as denied by us, or ſome of us, are theſe four,

1. *Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered at Jeruſalem to our Salvation.*

2. *Juſtification and Sanctification by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed.*

3. *The Reſurrection of the Body that dieth.*

4. *Chriſts coming without us, in his glorified Body, to judge the Quick and the Dead.*

The firſt Head of *G. Keith*'s Charge, (viz. *That we deny Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered at Jeruſalem to our Salvation*) Conſidered.

The denial of this he charges *directly* on *G. Whitehead*; on *W. Penn but by conſequence*, for approving *G. Whitehead*'s Books.

After he had made his Enumeration of Doctrines, he ſays, *Now, if you pleaſe, I ſhall proceed to my Proofs. Moſt of my Buſineſs is, to* Read *my Proofs out of their Books.* Who from theſe words would have expected any other, than that he would have read ſome Sentence out of ſome Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, wherein he had denied Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*; becauſe he ſaid, *Moſt of my buſineſs is, to read my Proofs out of their Books?* But inſtead of that, he attempts to prove it *Logically*: Thus he begins: *That this is oppoſed by them, I prove thus*, ſays he, *The Object of Faith is oppoſed by them, and therefore the Faith it ſelf muſt needs be oppoſed: I hope*, ſays he, *the Conſequence is clear enough, it needs no Proof.* Let us ſee then how he proves his Premiſe: *The Object of Chriſtian Faith*, ſays he, *is Chriſt, both God and Man, and yet but one Chriſt.* Here he hath ſhifted the Terms of his Propoſition already. Firſt he ſpake of Faith in Chriſt, as he *outwardly ſuffered at Jeruſalem.* By the words [*outwardly ſuffered* at *Jeruſalem*] I take him to mean (as is thereby gene-

generally understood) his *suffering Death* upon the Cross. Now he says, *The Object of Christian Faith is Christ, both God and Man.* But did he *outwardly suffer* at *Jerusalem as God? Was the Godhead crucified* and *put to Death?* He will not say it sure. If then the Object of Christian Faith be Christ, *both God and Man*, why did he before place it only in Christ, *as he outwardly suffered* for us at *Jerusalem?* I only touch this transiently, and that not to deliver my own sense, but to shew how *he blundered at the very entrance of his Work*, and that he is not an *exact* and *clean* Disputant. However, he goes on thus, *I offer to prove that* G. Whitehead *has denied Christ both to be God and Man.* (To the same purpose he spoke in his *Gross Error*, p. 14.) How! Deny'd him *both to be God and Man!* What does he own him to be then, if *neither God nor Man?* There have been some, who have denied Christ to be *God*, acknowledging him to be *Man*; there have been others, who have denied Christ to be *Man*, acknowledging him to be *God*. (Both *Condemnable.*) But who ever heard of any before, that denied Christ *both to be God and Man?* Yet this he charges on *G. Whitehead.* And first offers to prove that *G. Whitehead*, in a Book of his, called *The Light and Life of Christ within*, has denied Christ to be *God*. It were strange, one would think, that *G. Whitehead* should deny Christ to be *God*, and yet, about the same time too, write a Book of above 20 sheets, to assert and prove the *Divinity* of Christ, calling his Book, **The Divinity of Christ**, *and Unity of the Three that bear Record in Heaven, with the blessed End and Effects of Christs Appearance, coming in the Flesh, Suffering and Sacrifice for Sinners, Confessed and Vindicated by his Followers, called Quakers.* Which Book *G. Keith* cannot pretend Ignorance of, for he picks somewhat out of it, (though, as his manner is, *perversly*) in this very Narrative of his. The proof he now offers against *G. Whitehead*, is out of a Book of his called *The Light and Life of Christ within*, p. 47. in Answer

to

to *W. Burnet*, a Baptiſt Preacher, who writing of Chriſt, ſaid, *As he was God, he was Co-Creator with the Father, and ſo was before* Abraham, *and had glory with God before the world was, and in this ſence came down from Heaven.* To which *G. Whitehead* replied, *What Nonſenſe and Unſcripture-like Language is this, to tell of God being* Co-Creator *with the Father? Or that God had glory with God? Does not this imply two Gods, and that God had a Father? Let the Reader judge.* In theſe words *G. Whitehead* blamed not the *matter* expreſſed, but the *manner* of expreſſing it: He did not deny Chriſt to be *God*, nor that as *God* he was *Creator*, and before *Abraham*, &c. But he excepted againſt the word *Co-Creator*, as unſcripture-like Language, and implying *two Gods*. For ſince [*Co*] contracted from the Prepoſitive Particle [*Con*] ſignifies (*Cum*, or *Simul*) *with*, or *together with*, he that ſays God (or Chriſt, as *God*) was *Co-Creator*, muſt intend he was Creator *with himſelf*, or Creator *with another*. To ſay God was Creator *with*, or together with, *himſelf*, is that which G. *Whitehead* call'd *Nonſenſe*. To ſay God was Creator *with*, or together with, *Another*, is to imply *two Gods*, two Creators, which is that G. *Whitehead* called *Unſcripture like* Language. For as God is a pure, ſimple, *undivided* Eſſence or Being, ſo the Language of Scripture concerning God, is, *that God is One*, Gal. 3. 20. Mark 12, 29, 32. And although, in ſome reſpect this *One* is ſaid to be *Three*, 1 John 5. 7. yet in this reſpect of *Eſſence*, Being, and Godhead, theſe *Three* are there ſaid to be *One*: Not only (as of the Three that bear witneſs in Earth, *verſ.* 8.) *to agree in One*, but to be *One*. And Chriſt himſelf (with reſpect to his Godhead) ſays, *I and my Father are One*, John 10 30

G. *Keith* adds another Paſſage of G. *Whitehead*'s, or rather the ſame Paſſage in another place of the ſame Book, wherein he ſays, p. 15 G. *Whitehead denies the Divinity of Chriſt*, and that *he deceives the Nation and the Parlia-*

Parliament, by telling them, They own Chriſt to be both God and Man, and believe all that is Recorded of him in the Holy Scripture. In this *G. VVhitehead* hath *not deceived* either the Parliament, or the Nation, or any one in it. For certain it is, that the People called Quakers do own Chriſt to be *both God and Man*, and do believe all that is Recorded of him in the Holy Scriptures. But *G. Keith* did endeavour then to deceive his Hearers, and ſince to deceive his Readers, by ſuggeſting to them that *G. VVhitehead*, or any of the Quakers, did ever deny the Divinity of Chriſt, or not own Chriſt to be both God and Man.

The other Paſſage which *G. Keith* now brings, *Nar.* p. 15. taken out of p. 24. of *G. Whitehead*'s foremention'd Book called, *The Light and Life of Chriſt within*, whereupon the *Baptiſt*'s calling *God the Word, Co-Creator with the Father*, G. Whitehead anſwer'd, *To tell of the Word God, Co-Creator with the Father, is all one as to tell of God being Co-Creator with God, if the Father be God; and this is to make two Gods, two Creators*, &c. *For God, Co-Creator with the Father, plainly implies two.* This, as I noted, is one and the ſame Paſſage in Senſe, and almoſt in Words, with the former, and the ſame Anſwer ſerves to his Cavil againſt both. It is plain, to any conſiderate and unbyaſſed Reader, that *G. Whitehead* did not by theſe Words deny the *Divinity* of Chriſt, or diſown *Chriſt* to be *God*; but rather that he did own *Chriſt* to be *God*, and both the *Father* and *He* to be *one God*, and one Creator, not two: And therefore blamed the *Baptiſt* for uſing ſuch Expreſſions [*God Co-Creator with the Father*,] as implyed *two* Gods, *two* Creators. But that *G. Whitehead* did then (as well as now) own Chriſt to be God, is plain from ſeveral paſſages in that very Book (though that Book not treating ſo directly of that Subject, hath not ſo many Inſtances in it, as are in other Books of his.) In that very *Page* (47.) out of which

which he takes his first Quotation against *G. Whitehead* upon *John* 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie me with thine own self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was*; G. Whitehead says, 'Was not 'he the *true Christ*, the *Son of God*, that so prayed un-'to the Father? And in the same *Page* (just after the Words *G. Keith* carps at) upon the *Baptist's* saying, Which Word was God, yet he was not a Saviour as he was the Word or Creator of the World, *&c. G. Whitehead* replies, 'How then doth He say, I am *God*, 'a *Saviour*, &c. And in *Page* 48. upon the *Baptist's* say-ing, He was not a Saviour, as the *Root* and Creator of Man, but as he was to be the *Offspring* of Man, *&c. G. Whitehead* Answer'd, 'Do but mark the Confusion and 'Darkness of this Man, who hath denyed that *God*, the '*Word* or *Creator* of Man, is a *Saviour*; and *Christ*, as 'he was the *Root* and *Creator* of Man, and as He was the 'Eternal Son of God, from the Days of Eternity, 'he hath denied to be a *Saviour*, but as he was the *Off-'spring* of Man. Do but Eye the tendency of this Do-'ctrine; thus to deny *the Son of God* to be a *Saviour*;— 'whereas it is through *the Son of God*, that Eternal Life 'is received, *John* 3. 16. And God's Love was mani-'fest, in sending his *only begotten Son* into the World;— 'So here the Efficacy of *the Son of God*, and the *Eternal 'Word*, is proved against the *Baptist's* false and unscrip-'ture like Distinction. It was in the Year 1668. that this Book was Printed. In the Year 1669. *G. White-head* writ another Book (which I mentioned before) called, *The Divinity of Christ, and Unity of the Three that bear Record in Heaven; with the blessed End and Effects of Christ's Appearance, coming in the Flesh, Suffering and Sacrifice for Sinners, Confess'd and Vindicated by his Fol-lowers, called* Quakers. In that Book, between the Epi-stle and the first Chapter, giving a brief Account of what we own, touching the *Divinity* and *Godhead* of *Christ*,

he

he ſays, 'That there are Three that bear Record in 'Heaven, the Father, the Word and the Spirit, and 'that theſe Three are one both in *Divinity*, *Divine Sub-* 'ſtance and *Eſſence*; not three Gods, nor ſeparate Be- 'ings. That they are called by ſeveral Names in Scrip- 'ture,—yet *they are Eternally One in Nature and Being*; 'One Infinite Wiſdom, one Power, one Love, one 'Light and Life, *&c.* Then adds, *We never denied the* 'Divinity of Chriſt, as moſt *injuriouſly* we have been ac- 'cuſed by ſome prejudiced Spirits, who prejudicially 'in their perverſe Conteſts have ſought occaſion againſt 'us; as chiefly becauſe (when ſome of us were in Diſ- 'pute with ſome *Presbyterians*) we could not own their 'unſcriptural Diſtinction and Terms.——The Father's 'begetting the Son, and the Spirit's being ſent, we wit- 'neſs to, and own.—Yea, the *Son of God* is the bright- 'neſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Sub- 'ſtance.——So the Manifeſtation of the Father, *of the* 'Son, and Holy Spirit, we confeſs to, *&c.*—— And 'that *Jeſus Chriſt* being *in the Form of God*, thought it 'no robbery to be *equal with God*, and yet *as a Son*, was 'ſent of the Father, *&c.*—So that the *Deity* or *Divi-* 'nity of *Chriſt*, in his Eternal, Infinite, Glorious State, 'we really confeſs and own. In the Book itſelf, p. 18. 'He ſays, He (*Chriſt*) was *equal with God* in Glory, 'before the World was. Again, *p.* 19. It was never 'any Deſign, or Plot of ours, to endeavour to preju- 'dice the Minds of any againſt the *Deity* of Chriſt, and 'the Holy Ghoſt, as falſly and blaſphemouſly we are 'accuſed by this our prejudiced Oppoſer. Again, p. 22. '*We never diſowned the Deity of Chriſt*, or Holy Ghoſt, 'as falſly and injuriouſly is inſinuated againſt us. Again, 'p. 26. Charging us with deſigning to blaſt and over- 'throw the Deity of Chriſt, and the Holy Ghoſt; up- 'on which, Blaſphemers, and Blaſphemy, and damna- 'ble Speeches, are hideouſly caſt upon us, but *moſt un-*

'*juſtly*

'*justly* and *falsly*. For no such design ever had we, as 'either to blast or overthrow the *Deity* of Christ, or 'Holy Spirit, we having openly professed and declared 'the contrary, both in Words and Writings. Again 'p. 32. That the Divine Essence, or *Godhead*, can be 'but one, and this *in each* of the Three, we never de-'nied. Again, p. 38. I have heard of some, beyond 'the Sea, who were accused with denying the Divini-'ty of Christ; but I know of none here, that either de-'ny the Divinity of Christ, or him to be *of one Substance* 'with the Father. Again, p. 41. Christ being the 'Brightness of the Glory of God, and the express Image 'of his Divine Substance, as also **truly called the Son 'of his Love**, *&c.* Second Part of the same Book, p. 3. '*We never denied the Deity* or Divinity of either Father, '*Word*, or Holy Ghost. Again, p. 39. His Opponent *T. Danson*, having charged the Quakers with *denying Christ to be God*, G. Whitehead Answers, '*This is an* 'apparent *slander* cast upon us, as our Books and Wri-'tings do shew, that *we never denied Christ to be God*, or 'his Divinity, *&c.* Again, p. 54. As to Socinianism, 'as he calls it, we are neither discipled in it, nor bap-'tized into *Socinus* his Name, neither do we own him 'for our Author or Pattern in those things which we 'believe and testifie; nor yet do we own several Prin-'ciples, which *J. O.* relates, as from *Socinus*, and prin-'cipally that of Christ's being (God, but) not the '*most High God*. It was never our Principle; for tho' 'we do confess to his Condescension, Humility and Suf-'fering in the Days of his Flesh, wherein he appeared 'in the form of a Servant, being made in Fashion as a 'Man: Yet *his being in the Form of God*, and being glo-'rified with the same Glory he had with the Father be-'fore the World began, and *his being God over all*, blessed 'for ever; *These things we professed and believed in the be-'ginning, and do the same still, it never being in our Hearts,*

'*in*

'*in the leaſt, to oppoſe or deſert them.* Again, p. 58. As 'to a great part of his (*J. O's.*) Book, wherein he 'goes about to prove the Divinity or Deity of Chriſt, '*&c.* We are *unconcerned* therein, *having never denied* '*Chriſt's Divinity.* Here one would think, were Inſtances enough, of *G. Whitehead's* (and ours) owning and confeſſing Chriſt to be God, to make *G. Keith bluſh* forcharging him with denying it. But becauſe I know *G. Keith* hath too far, and too long, abandoned Modeſty and Vertue, to be eaſily drawn to *bluſh*, I will add ſome more, out of another Book, written by *G. Whitehead*, and Printed the ſame Year 1669. called, *Chriſt aſcended above the Clouds*, &c. in Anſwer to one *John Newman*, a *Baptiſt*; who having it ſeems, aſſerted that, *The Word was in the beginning, but Chriſt was in time, not till he had taken Nature upon him*, and *became in the likeneſs of ſinful Man, being born of the Virgin* Mary, *&c.* G. Whitehead Anſwer'd, p. 12. '*This Aſſer-* 'tion oppoſeth the Deity and Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt, and 'contradicts the faithful Teſtimonies of the Holy Men 'of God in the Scriptures of Truth. Again, p. 14. 'Though Jeſus ſignifies a Saviour, and Chriſt Anointed; 'yet to *confine thoſe Names only to the Manhood*, ſtill a-'grees with the erroneous Doctrine before, that Chriſt 'was not the Word from the beginning; whereas he 'took upon him the Manhood in Time; in which, tho' 'we own him as the anointed of God; yet he was alſo 'Gods anointed, as he was his only begotten and De-'light (and ſo *the* Son *from his Eternal Being or Sub-* ſtance) before the Mountains and Hills were ſettled. 'And in p. 15. he expreſly calls that Opinion *Hereti-* 'cal, that *denies the Divinity of Chriſt.* Again, p. 16. 'To ſay Chriſt cannot dwell in Man, doth not only 'oppoſe his Spirituality, Deity and Omnipotency, 'but, *&c.*—And if He be *perfect God*, he can dwell in 'his People, as he hath promiſed. Again, p. 18. It

'ſtill

'ſtill ſtrictly limits, or tyes up the Name Jeſus Chriſt 'to a Body of Fleſh and Blood, and ſo covertly denies 'his Being, before he took on him that viſible Body of 'Fleſh, Blood and Bones, and ſo **oppoſeth his Divinity** 'as before. Again, p. 68. What a *groſs Error* is it to 'affirm, that Chriſt was not from the beginning (or 'that he was not the Word in the beginning) and 'what a *denyal of his Divinity*, like the *old Hereticks?* 'Again, ib. Much more might be ſaid *on the behalf of* 'the *Divinity* of the Son of God, or Chriſt, who was the 'Word in the beginning, and with the Father in his 'Glory before the World began. In another Book alſo of *G. Whitehead's*, called, *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, &c. Printed in the Year 1671. (to which *G. Keith* himſelf writ a Poſtſcript) in the Epiſtle, p. 3. *G. Whitehead* ſpeaking concerning the true Saviour, or the Man Chriſt Jeſus, ſays, 'Whom we have frequently 'Confeſt, *both as to his Divinity*, and as to his taking up-'on him the Body, prepared for him to do the Will of 'God in, according to the Scriptures of Truth; yea, 'both his outward and inward Appearance, his ſuffer-'ing Nature and glorified State, and *his Divinity*; in 'both we have always truly Believed and Confeſſed, 'even his Dignity, Spiritual outgoing from of old, 'from Everlaſting, as alſo his outward Birth, *&c.* And in the Book, p. 36. *G. Whitehead* replies upon his Opponent, 'What is this, but *to deny the Divinity* 'of *Chriſt*, &c? Again, p. 40. That the Holy Pro-'phets, Apoſtles and Miniſters both pointed and teſti-'fied unto Jeſus Chriſt, both as Man born of the Vir-'gin (or to his coming in the Fleſh) and unto his *Di-'vinity*; and Manifeſtation in Spirit, this is owned. Again, p. 41. 'I perceive he is ignorant of Chriſt, 'both *as the Son of God*, and as the Son of Man: For 'according to the Spirit, *he was the Son of God*, &c. Again, p. 52. ſays he to his Opponent *R. Gordon*,

'Thou

'Thou having confeſt, that his (Chriſt's) out-goings 'were from Everlaſting, haſt thereby granted to what 'I ſaid, that the *Son of God* and his Light are not under 'a Limitation as to Time and Place, eſpecially if thou 'wilt own his Divinity, or that he ever was the Son 'of God before he took a Body in the Womb of the 'Virgin; but if thou doſt not own that the Son of 'God was before then, than *thou doſt not own his Divi-'nity*, nor him no more than a Finite Creature.

I chooſe to confront *G. Keith* out of theſe Books, rather than others, becauſe theſe are ſome of *the Books he hath cited*; and out of which he hath pretended to make good his Charges againſt us, and therefore he may not be ſuppoſed to have been ignorant, that theſe Paſſages were in them. But how horribly unjuſt and wicked he muſt be in charging *G. Whitehead* with denying the Divinity of Chriſt, or that Chriſt is God, who hath ſo fully and frequently aſſerted and maintained his Divinity againſt others, and that at the ſame time wherein he is charged to have denied it, I leave to the Reader's Judgment.

The next part of his Charge againſt *G. Whitehead* is, *That he has denied Chriſt to be Man*, Nar. p. 16. For proof of which he cites that Book of *G. Whitehead's* which I lately mentioned, called, *The Divinity of Chriſt*, &c. p. 18. (but the Reader muſt take Notice, It is in the Second Part of that Book, for the Book is by its Pages, divided into two parts.) The Words *G. Keith* cites firſt, are theſe, *If the Body and Soul of the Son of God were both Created, doth not this render him a Fourth Perſon*, &c. There *G. Keith* breaks off with an *&c.* But it follows in *G. Whitehead's* Book thus; *For Creation was in Time, which contradicts their Doctrine of three Diſtinct, Increated, Co-Eternal, Co-Eſſential Perſons in the Deity, ſeeing that which was Created was not ſo.* This ſhews the occaſion of thoſe Words, and that they were *ad hominem*, to ſhew his Opponent (*T. Danſon*) the

abſurdity of his Aſſertions about the *Perſonalities of the Deity*. But this Paſſage, though *G. Keith* mentioned it, to make the greater noiſe and flouriſh, he leans not on: For without Commenting on it, he ſays, *But the ſtreſs I lay is in the Words following*, which he gives thus. *But herein, whether doth not his and their ignorance of the only begotten of the Father plainly appear.* (There he leaves out theſe Words [*And their denyal of Chriſts Divinity*] which he knew would make againſt him, and then goes on thus) *Where doth the Scripture ſay, That his Soul was Created? For was not he the brightneſs of the Fathers Glory, and the expreſs Image of his Divine Subſtance? But ſuppoſing the Soul of Chriſt was* (*with the Body*) *created in Time*, &c. There *G. Keith* breaks off again with an *&c.* But in *G. Whiteheads* Book it follows thus; *I ask, if from Eternity he was a Perſon diſtinct from God and his Holy Spirit, without either Soul or Body? And where doth the Scripture ſpeak of any Perſon without either Soul or Body? Let's have plain Scripture.* This further ſhews, that this whole Paſſage related to *Danſon*'s ſtrange Notions of the *Perſonalities of the Deity*, to ſhew his Confuſion therein, and alſo to bring him back to the Scripture, which he, with the reſt, (for there were ſeveral other Prieſts concerned alſo at that time in the Controverſie) had ſet up for the *only Rule* in Religion, but would not keep to. Therefore did *G. Whitehead* put it upon them, *Where doth the Scripture ſay? Let's have plain Scripture:* But *G. Keith* perverts *the whole Paſſage*, and abuſes *G. Whitehead*, for he tells his Auditors, *Here ye ſee, He will not own that Chriſt had a Created Soul.* Th. Danſon, *being a Presbyterian Miniſter*, (ſays he) *did plead, That Chriſt as Man had a Created Soul.* Nay hold there, *Tho. Danſon* ſpake of *the Son of God.* And to thoſe Terms, *G. Whitehead* anſwered, *To this*, I ſay, if the Body and Soul of *the Son of God* were both Created, doth not this render him

a

a fourth Person? For Creation was in time, which contradicts their Doctrine of three Distinct, Increated, Co-Eternal, Co-Essential Persons in the Deity, seeing that which was Created was not so. Plain it is from hence, that in this whole Answer, *G. VVhitehead* did not so much express his own Sense, as *expose Danson's*, and the other Priests, their *Confusion*, and Contradiction to themselves and one another. Therefore he asks *Danson*, *If from Eternity*, He (*the Son of God*) *was a Person distinct from God and his Holy Spirit, without either Soul or Body?* And where says he, doth the Scripture speak of any Person *without either Soul or Body?* And because you Priests contend so hotly, that the Scripture is the *only Rule* of Faith and Life (for that was part of that Controversie, p. 45, *&c.*) Let's have plain Scripture? Where doth the Scripture say, that *the Son of God*, the only begotten of the Father, one of the Three Distinct, Increated, Co-Eternal, Co-Essential Persons in the Deity (as ye call him) that *his Soul* was Created? Thus *G. VVhitehead hampered* his Adversaries, by putting the Questions, which shew'd the *absurdity* and *inconsistency* of their Notions and Assertions; a way of dealing with *G. Keith* hath sometimes used towards an unfair Adversary himself. And though he says, *such a way of questioning plainly imports a Denial*, now that he writes against Truth, and the Friends of it; yet when formerly he wrot in *Truth's Defence* (a Book under that Title, Printed in 1682. in Answer to his Countreyman *John Alexander* of *Leith*) he told him, p. 59. '*J. Alexander* ought to know, that to *query* a thing, 'will not *conclude* that the Questionist doth *positively* 'affirm or *deny* what is *Queried*. But it is common to him to forget himself, as oft as he has *a Mind not to remember*. However, I think those Words (where doth the Scripture say that his Soul was Created?) which *G. Keith* would have taken *notice* of, and which he says

he laies the *ſtreſs* in, will not bear the *ſtreſs* he lays, if *right notice* (with reſpect to the occaſion, drift and manner of Speech) be taken of them. But that *G. VVhitehead* hath fully and frequently owned the Holy *Manhood* of Chriſt, with reſpect both to *Soul* and *Body*, ſhall be ſhewed, by more Inſtances than one. At preſent let me ſhew *G. Keith* what he hath written concerning the Soul of Chriſt, in his *VVay caſt up*, p. 104. 'And therefore, ſays he, let all the Scriptures be ſearched, and it ſhall not be found that Chriſt became Man, 'and took to himſelf *the Soul of Man*, at his Conception in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*; but *only* that he 'took Fleſh, and was the Son of *Mary*, of *David*, and of 'Abraham. And in p. 103. 'Yet before this, even *from* 'the beginning, he was the Heavenly Man, and *had his* 'Soul and heavenly Fleſh and Blood, &c. Here *G. Keith* is poſitive, that Chriſt the heavenly Man, *had his Soul from the beginning*, before he did partake of our Fleſh and Blood by his outward Birth. And he is as poſitive that *Chriſt did not take to himſelf the Soul of Man*, nay that he did not *become Man*, at his Conception in the Womb of the Virgin *Mary*. How will he ſcape now from falling into *Appollinarius* his Error, or contradicting himſelf to eſcape it.

G. Keith brings another Paſſage out of another Book of *G. VVhitehead*'s, in order to prove that *G. VVhitehead* has denied Chriſt to be Man. He brings it in thus. *Next I prove* (ſays he, p. 16.) *that* G. Whitehead *ſays*, *He* (ſpeaking of Chriſt) *has not the Body of a Man. See his Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 29, 41. This were an *home Proof*, if he could make it good. But, being *conſcious* to himſelf of the *falſeneſs* of this Charge, and how eaſily it may be *diſproved* out of *G. VVhitehead*'s Book, he *ſtaggers* in his undertaking, and before he recites *G. VVhitehead*'s Words, makes his own excuſe thus. *If he has ſaid otherwiſe in any of his late Printed Books, I am glad*

of

of it. *But let him retract these, for these have done much mischief. Now,* says he, *when I said he was Orthodox, I mean not as he was Heterodox: For there is a* G. Whitehead *Orthodox, and a* G. Whitehead *not Orthodox. I did not know* G. Whitehead *not Orthodox till lately, I do not say there are two Persons in* G. Whitehead, *he is but one and the same Person (in this and some other things) Orthodox and not Orthodox. — I own it, that I have cited divers Passages out of his later Books that are Orthodox to prove him sound,* &c. This plainly shews, that *G. Keith* knew *G. VVhiteheads* Judgement to be otherwise than he has represented him. But is it not a most horrible Wickedness, for one Man designedly and wilfully to represent another Man's Judgment *quite contrary to what he knows it to be?* Now let us return to *G. Keith's* Charge and Proof. His Charge is, that *G. VVhitehead* says, *He* (Christ) *has not the Body of a Man.* His Proof is from the Book last mentioned, p. 29, 41. thus. *Or dost thou look for Christ, as the Son of* Mary, *to appear outwardly in a bodily Existence to save thee, according to thy VVords,* p. 30. *If thou dost, thou mayst look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him.* Is this a Proof that *G. VVhitehead* says, *Christ has not the Body of a Man?* I expected, when *G. Keith* said, I prove that *G. VVhitehead* says, He (Christ) has not the Body of a Man; he would have pretended, at least, to have produced some place, wherein *G. VVhitehead* had expresst *those very VVords.* But instead of that, he brings a place, that hath *neither those VVords,* nor *any thing like them.* There is not in these Words of *G. VVhitehead's* a Denial, either that Christ hath a bodily Existence, or that he will appear in that Bodily Existence: But from them may be gathered, that that Appearance of Christ shall not be *to save,* but *to judge* the World at the last Day, and that that Day was *not so near at hand,* as *R. Gordon* seem'd to expect or think! For the Words

are, or doſt thou look for Chriſt, *as the Son of* Mary to appear outwardly in a bodily Exiſtence to **ſave thee**, according to thy Words, p. 30. If thou doſt, thou mayſt look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt ſee ſuch an Appearance of him, to wit, only as the Son of *Mary* and to **ſave thee**? The Word [*Such*] may reſpect the *End* of his Appearance, as well as the *Manner* of it. The End, *viz.* to ſave thee; as if Man ſhould not be ſaved until the Day of general Judgment. The manner, *viz.* As the Son of *Mary*, as if Chriſt ſhould come in no higher, powerful and more glorious Appearance than as he was the Son of *Mary*. And as to the Time of it (if *R. Gordon* be dead) his Eyes may be already dropt out, without ſeeing it, and yet the Appearance of Chriſt in a bodily Exiſtence to judge the World at the laſt Day, be yet to come, and owned to be ſo. Theſe things I mention, to ſhew the feeble grounds *G. Keith* hath for his Cavils. But from the Book it ſelf, out of which *G. Keith* took theſe Words, it is manifeſt that *G. Whitehead* uſed theſe Words only to manifeſt his Opponent (*Gordon*'s) Confuſion and Contradiction, for they were not treating then concerning the Exiſtence or Body of Chriſt, but concerning Juſtification, Redemption, Salvation by Chriſt, which *R. Gordon* (it ſeems) had aſſerted was wrought and compleated by the Sacrifice of Chriſt's Crucified Body upon the Croſs, and yet would put off Believers from being made Partakers of that Salvation, till after their bodily Death, that they ſhould be raiſed from the Grave; yet granted, that it muſt be done by Chriſt's Appearance in Believers, through Faith by his Spirit: Whereupon ſays *G. Whitehead* to him (*Nature of Chriſtian.* p. 29.) 'See thy *manifeſt Contradiction*, viz. A 'perfect Juſtification and Redemption (of Sinners) 'without them, when no good is wrought in them. But '(*in Contradiction*) now it muſt be done by Chriſts Ap-

'pearance

'pearance in Believers, through Faith by his Spirit. 'As also thou granteſt, that his appearing the ſecond 'time is without Sin to Salvation: But when thinkeſt 'thou, that muſt be? Is it in this Life, or hereafter? 'Thou ſayſt, that after the bodily Death, you ſhall be 'raiſed out of the Grave, and made partakers of that 'Salvation, p. 13. 'Tis ſtrange the Salvation of Sin-'ners, yea, of the whole World, as thy Word is, 'ſhould be compleated at once, above 1600. Years ſince, '—and yet to be ſo long after Death lookt for, how 'long, is not known to thee; or (doſt thou pretend 'to know, or think thou know'ſt, and thereupon) doſt 'thou look for Chriſt, *as the Son of* Mary, to appear 'outwardly, in a bodily Exiſtence **to ſave thee**, accord-'ing to thy Words, p. 30. If thou doſt, thou mayſt 'look till thy Eyes drop out, before **Thou** wilt ſee '**ſuch** an Appearance of him.

This ſays *G. Keith*, *is but one place, that is, that Chriſt will not ſo appear: But why*, adds he, *will he not ſo appear, but becauſe he has no bodily Exiſtence without us.* G. Whitehead ſaid not ſo. That's only *G. Keith's wrong Inference.* And *That*, ſays he, p. 16. *I come now to prove.* So then what he has hitherto ſaid is *no proof* of it, for it ſeems he is but *now coming* to prove it. For which purpoſe, *Nar.* p. 17. he cites another Paſſage of *G. Whitehead's* in p. 41. thus. *And that he exiſteth outwardly, bodily, without us, at God's right Hand: What Scripture-Proof hath he for theſe Words? And then what, and where, is God's right Hand? Is it Viſible, or Inviſible? Within us, or without us only? And is Chriſt the Saviour, as an outward bodily Exiſtence or Perſon without us, diſtinct from God, and on that conſideration to be worſhipped as God, Yea or Nay? And where doth the Scripture ſay, he is outwardly and bodily glorified at God's right Hand? Do theſe Terms expreſs the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began, in which he is now glo-*

rified? These last Words, from Where doth the Scripture say? Is, he says, the thing that *Rivets*. But if, by *Rivetting*, he means *Fastening* a Proof upon *G. VVhitehead*, that he denies Christ to have a bodily Existence without us, *G. Keith* himself has *cut off the Head of his Rivet*, and made it uncapable to hold, by saying (which I shewed before, from his Answer to his Countryman, *John Alexander*) *He ought to know, that to Query a thing, will not conclude that the Questionist doth positively affirm or deny what is Queried.* Truths Defence, p. 59. Especially, when it is only used in a Socratical way of Disputing or Arguing against an Adversary (as it is used here) and which he observes to be *G. VVhitehead*'s way of Writing. And indeed from the whole Answer (which fills near two Pages) out of which *G. Keith* hath cropt his Quotation, it appears that *G. VVhitehead*'s drift was to shew the Absurdity and Inconsistency of his Opponent's Assertion; which was (as in p. 40.) that Christs Apostles, and all his Ministers in all Ages — pointed to Jesus the Son of *Mary*, *this* Son of Man, with an Hosannah to *this* Son of *David*, *and to none before him*, or to any ever since. These Words [*The Son of* Mary, *this Son of Man*, *this Son of* David, and *to none before him*] had a tendency to *deny the Divinity or Godhead of Christ*, and to set up the Body, that was born of the Virgin, for the *only*, *whole*, *intire Christ* and *Saviour*. And therefore, to this *G. VVhitehead* answered, *That the Holy Prophets, Apostles and Ministers, both pointed and testified unto Jesus Christ, both as Man born of the Virgin* (*or to his coming in the Flesh*) and *unto his Divinity, and Manifestation in Spirit, this is owned. But that they all cried Hosanna to the Son of* David, *is a mistake: For it was the Multitudes that went before and that followed* (*when Christ rid to* Jerusalem) *that cryed Hosannah to the Son of* David, *Mat.* 21. 9. Adding, *Many can now cry Hosannah, who never knew his Salvation with-*

n,

in, now believed in his Power; but rather ſpiritually crucifie him. And the Scribes and Phariſees could talk of Chriſts being the Son of David,—*when they neither truly believed nor owned him (that was the true Chriſt) either as the Root or Offſpring of* David. *But Chriſt asked theſe Phariſees and Scribes (who ſaid Chriſt is the Son of* David*) this Queſtion, VVhat think ye of Chriſt? VVhoſe Son is he? They ſaid unto him, The Son of* David. *He ſaid unto them, How then doth* David *in Spirit call him Lord?*—*If* David *then call him Lord, how is he his Son,* &c? *Now* ſays *G. VVhitehead* there, *VVas not this the true Chriſt, whom* David *in Spirit called Lord, before he took upon him Fleſh, or came of his Seed?* There's another Queſtion put to his Opponent, who had aſſerted, That all the Apoſtles and Miniſters of Chriſt in all Ages,—pointed to Jeſus the Son of *Mary, this* Son of Man, with an Hoſannah to this Son of *David*, and *to none* before him. Was not this the true Chriſt, whom *David* in Spirit called Lord, ſays *G. VVhitehead*? What then? Did this Queſtion imply, that *G. VVhitehead* denied Chriſt according to the Fleſh (or as he was born of *Mary*) to be the Son or Offſpring of *David*? Nothing leſs: For he ſays, *he took upon him Fleſh, and came of* David's *Seed, and is owned, as pointed at, and teſtified unto by the Holy Prophets, Apoſtles,* &c. *as Man born of the Virgin.* No more doth his asking his Opponent (for it is not a general Queſtion, but particular, to his Opponent, grounded upon the particular Terms his Opponent had expreſt himſelf in) thus, Whereupon *I ask him* (ſeeing he would reſtrain *all* to the fleſhly Appearance, and make *all* the Apoſtles, *&c.* to have pointed to Jeſus the Son of *Mary, this* Son of Man, with an Hoſannah to *this* Son of *David*, and to *none* before him) *If he hath ſo conſidered him to be God the Saviour, or the Son from the Subſtance of the Father, as ſome of his Brethren have confeſſed the Son is? And what Scripture-Proof hath he* (who pretends ſo highly

ly to Scripture, and blames us though falſly; for not holding to it) *for theſe Words, He exiſteth outwardly bodily without us, at God's right Hand? And where doth the Scripture ſay, He is outwardly and bodily glorified at God's right Hand? Do theſe Terms expreſs the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began, in which he is now glorified?* The Exception here is *not againſt the thing*, but the *Terms* by which it is expreſt. The *Thing* that Chriſt hath a bodily Exiſtence without us, and is therein glorified, and that at God's right hand, is ſo far from being denied, that it *was never doubted*. But that this ſhould be expreſt in ſuch Terms as the Holy Scripture doth not afford, and which would limit Chriſt to any certain place, or exclude him (by the Word outward) from being in his Saints, is juſtly excepted againſt, as contrary both to the Nature of Chriſt, and Scope of the Scriptures. And therefore *G. Whitehead* asks his Opponent, *what Scripture-Proof hath he? Where doth the Scripture ſay ſo?* And the more to lay open his Opponents abſurdity in this Caſe, goes on queſtioning him, in the ſame place, p. 41. thus. And then, *What and where is Gods right Hand? Is it viſible, or inviſible? within us, or without us* only? Now *G. Keith* might as well from hence infer and charge *G. Whitehead* with denying that God has a right Hand, as he doth from the other Queſtions, That Chriſt hath no bodily Exiſtence without us; and both a like abſurdly and falſly. For he himſelf ſays in another place alſo of his Book called, *Truth's Defence*, p. 165. When his Opponent would have drawn a Concluſion, and inferred a Charge, from a Query, 'What is propoſed in the 'Query is not poſitively concluded one way or another, 'as the Nature of a Query doth plainly demonſtrate. And blaming his then Opponent, for urging Matters of Doctrine in unſcriptural Terms, he ſays, in *Truth's Defence*, p. 169. 'Why is it, that the Scriptures are ſo

'full

'full and large in their Teſtimony to the Doctrines 'and Principles of Religion, but to let us underſtand, 'that all the Principles and Doctrines of the Chriſtian 'Faith, which God requireth in common of all Chriſti-'ans, are expreſly there Delivered and Recorded? 'And therefore, ſays he, for my part, what I cannot 'find expreſly delivered in Scripture, I ſee no Reaſon 'why I ſhould receive or believe it as any common Ar-'ticle or Principle of the Chriſtian Faith or Life: And p. 170. he adds, 'Now if this were but received among 'thoſe called Chriſtians, that nothing ſhould be requi-'red by one ſort from another, as an Article of Faith, or 'Doctrine, or Principle of the Chriſtian Religion in com-'mon to be believed, but what is *expreſly delivered* in 'the Scripture, in plain expreſs Scripture Terms, 'of how great an Advantage might it be to bring a true 'Reconcilement among them, and beget true Chriſtian 'Unity, Peace, Love and Concord? Yet *G. Keith* him-ſelf (who but in the Year 1682. wrote thus) doth now (which ſhews his *inconſiſtency* with himſelf, and *Injuſtice* to *G. Whitehead*) charge *G. Whitehead* with *denying the thing it ſelf*, becauſe he did *but ask* his Opponent *for a Scripture-Proof*, of a thing laid down *not in Scripture Terms*. So induſtrious is he now to ſeek an Advantage (inſtead of furthering a Reconcilement among them called Chriſtians) to hinder any ſuch Reconcile-ment, and cauſe a greater diſtance between them; and inſtead of begetting true Chriſtian Unity, Peace, Love and Concord, to break and deſtroy (as much as in him lies) that Love and Peace that hath been, and (but for him, and ſuch other Incendiaries) might be, and increaſe among them. But though *G. Whitehead* did reject the *Baptiſts* unſcriptural Terms; yet that he owned the Manhood of Chriſt, as well as his Divinity, may be ſeen in another Book alſo of his called, *The Quakers Plainneſs detecting Fallacy* (a Book not written

t'other Day, but in 1674. two and twenty Years ago) where p. 18. answering an Objection, that we own nothing but the Divine Nature to be Christ, he answers, 'Where proves he these words to be ours? Have we 'not plainly and often confest also, that the Divine Na-'ture or Word, Cloathed with the most holy Manhood, 'and as having taken Flesh of the Seed of *Abraham*, was 'and is the Christ.

Before I pass to *G. Keith*'s next Proof, I must here take notice of a Marginal note which *G. Keith*, makes in his seventeenth p. relating to the Book he last cited, of *G. Whitehead*'s, called *The Nature of Christianity*. The Reader may take notice, that in p. 15. when it was Objected to him, that the Book which he then mentioned was written Anticiptly, and that he had written in Vindication of our Principles since; He there, to turn off the Objection, says, *I do say, If it were my last Words, I know not that I ever Read a line of this Book, till I came last to England.* But here, quoting another Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, which he could not pretend Ignorance of, in as much as he himself, was not only concerned with *G. Whitehead*, in the controversy on which that Book was written, but had also a part in the same Book against his Country-man *Rob. Gordon*, (whom he, Principally, had undertaken to Answer in another Book, called *The Light of Truth Triumphing*, Published but the Year before) Now to secure himself (if he could) from the like Objection, he adds here, his *Marginal* note thus, Note, *There is an Additional Postscript by me* G. Keith, *put to this Book of* G. Whitehead, *Nature of Christianity, the which Postscript I left in a Manuscript at* London, *and with the Quakers; Printed with this of* G. Whitehead. *I acknowledge* (says he) *my want of due Consideration, that I did not better consider* G. Whitehead's, *words in that Book, having many Years ago Read it, but too overly, and not having*

having seen it since, for many Years, till of late. Does this sound *likely?* Does it savour of *Sincerity* and plainness? Or does it not rather look like *a silly shifting Excuse*, for his Condemning that now, which he owned then, and yet pretending to be the same in Judgment, that he was then? He goes on in his note thus, *But I am sure, I did really then believe* (as I now do) *that Christ as man, did outwardly and bodily exist without us; for proof of which see my words in that Additional Postscript*, p. 73. where at N. 11. *I blame* R. Gordon, *for saying, That the now present, Glorified Existence of that Body* (or man *Christ*) *that suffered at* Jerusalem, *is denied by some Teachers among us.* And to be sure, he did then really believe (and had good cause so to do) that *G. Whitehead*, and all the Quakers, did so believe as well as himself (which he had no cause since to disbelieve) and therefore he did than *Vindicate them* all, as well as himself, charging *Gordon*, with a *Lye*, and false Accusation, for saying the contrary. And yet, whatever pretence he may make of his Ignorance, what was in other Books of G. *Whitehead*'s, written but a little before, he may not be supposed Ignorant of what was in that Book (which he himself had a share in) out of which, yet he now makes his greatest Cavil, on this Head, against, *G. Whitehead.* He adds in his note, *I confess I happened to find Divers Passages in* G. Whitehead's, *and other Quakers Books, that seemed to me unsound; but in an excess of Charity, I did construe them to be better meant than worded, and that they had rather unwarily slipped from them, than that they were the expressions of their unsound mind*, &c. How long it is since this *Accident befel him*, that (as he words it) he *happened to find* those divers passages which seemed to him unsound, he does not tell. But the tenour of his words import it to have been long ago: For (if ever he did) to be sure he has not *exceeded in Charity* towards the Quakers, of late Years. But whenever

ever he had found any paſſages, either in *G. Whitehead*'s, or other Quakers Books, that had ſeemed to him *unſound*, had he been *really ſound* himſelf, and *ſoundly* (tho' not exceſſively) *Charitable*, he would have *Charitably*, and Friendly, in a private manner, have opened ſuch paſſages to the reſpective Authors of ſuch Books, and have underſtood from themſelves, their Senſe and Meaning therein, that thereby he might have both *inform'd* and *reform'd* their Minds and Judgments, in the paſſages, if they had been really unſound; or they have *rectified* his *miſtaking* underſtanding, by manifeſting to him the *ſoundneſs*, both of their minds and words. And this *Friendly* Office, he might more eaſily and inoffenſively have undertaken, if (as he ſays) he conſtrued thoſe Paſſages, which to him ſeem'd unſound, to be better *meant* than *worded*, and that they had rather *unwarily ſlipt* from them, than that they were the expreſſions of an unſound Mind. But tho' he has not told us when, that *exceſſive Charity* of his *began*, yet he pretty plainly intimates when it *ended*, and *why*, by ſaying, I conſtrued thoſe paſſages, better meant than worded,—*until that of late, I had found them to Juſtify the ſame, and the like unſound words, in my Adverſaries in* Penſilvania, *and to hate and excommunicate me for telling them of them.* Ay, there's the *Hing* of the buſineſs! their *Excommunicating him*, as he calls it (that is, their declaring him to be gone out from them, and their Communion, and to be no longer one of them) From that time forward, (and ſome time before) his *exceſs of Charity* turned to an *exceſs of Enmity*, and then he ſaw the ſame things, and Perſons to be *far worſe* than he ſaw them before, becauſe he ſaw them with a *far worſe* Eye. But to go on to his Charge and Proofs.

The next Proof he brings, that *G. Whitehead* has denied the Exiſtence of Chriſt in a body without us, is out of a Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, called *Chriſt aſcended*

ded above the Clouds, Printed in 1669. in anſwer to *Jo. Newman*, a Baptiſt. The Quotation begins thus, p. 17. *Jo. Newman, his Opponent's words were from Rev.* 1.7. *Thoſe that pierced him in his Body of Fleſh, ſhall ſee that Body Viſibly come again*, p. 21, 22. G. Whitehead, *anſwereth, Theſe are not the words of Scripture, but added, altho' to add or diminiſh be forbidden under a Penalty*, Rev. 22.18,19. *Yet this Mans preſumption leads him to incur that*; There G. *Keith*, breaks off with a daſh, thus, ——thereby leaving out what follows next, in G. *Whitehead*, which is thus, *See alſo for anſwer to him*, Rev. 1.8. and 13,14.16. *In none of which is Jeſus Chriſt either called (or repreſented as) a Body of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones, viſibly to come again.* The leaving out theſe words, was not fair in G. *Keith*, becauſe they ſhew upon what ground G. *Whitehead*, oppoſed the Baptiſts, and what *ſort of Body* it was they diſputed about, *viz. a Body of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones.* Certain it is indeed, that that Body which was pierced on the Croſs, was a *Body of Fleſh, Blood, and Bones.* And the Baptiſts, from *Rev.* 1.7. ſaid, Thoſe that pierced him in his Body of Fleſh, ſhall ſee *that Body viſibly come again*, not ſo much as mentioning any change in it. G. *Keith*, thereupon, Nar. p. 17. ſays, *Is there any thing here offenſive? Nothing* (adds he) *but what is the declared Opinion of the Church of* Rome, *the Church of* England, *the Presbyterians, Independents, Baptiſts, and mine all along.* He had forgot it ſeemes (tho' I lately put him in mind of it) that in his Book called *The way caſt up* (Printed 1677. long after the Book he carps at) he ſaid, 'That Body that 'was crucified on the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*, and is now 'aſcended and glorified in Heaven——*is no more a Body 'of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but a pure, Ethereal, or Heavenly 'Body*, p. 131. And although (to ſhew his own Confuſion) he there ſays, That Body, notwithſtanding its being *changed* from being a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones,

Bones, to be no more a Body of Flesh Blood and Bones, but a pure Ethereal, or Heavenly Body, re-mains *the same in substance*, that it was on Earth, making the change (from being a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, to be no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones) to be a change not in substance, but in mode and manner only of its being: Yet he had no reason to cavil with, or blame *G. Whitehead*, for opposing the Baptists notion of a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, now in Heaven, since he himself declares, it is no *more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones*, but a pure, Ethereal Body, which the Baptists, I am confident never dreamt of, and which, I suppose, none of the Churches or People, he has named, will agree with him in, if he will now *agree with himself*. But he would have found less cause, or colour to quarrel with *G. Whitehead*, about that description of Christ, in Rev. 1. if he had considered what himself hath writ, further upon that Subject, in his said *Way cast up*, p. 141, 142. N. 6. Where treating of Christ the Heavenly Man, he says, 'And as *John*, 'Rev. 1. describeth him, he is a wonderfully great Man, 'even that Son of Man, whom *John* saw, after his A-'scension, in the midst of the Golden Candlesticks, e-'ven he that liveth and was dead, *ver.* 18. to shew that 'it was *the Man Christ*, and he had in his right Hand 'seven Stars, which are expounded to be the Seven 'Angels or Pastors of the Seven Churches. Now mark. 'This sheweth (saith he) it is *not his external Person, or* 'outward Body that is here described, for it is impossi-'ble to conceive, how he can hold a number of Men, in 'the right Hand of his external Person. Therefore '*by his right Hand is signified his Power*, as he is the '*great Heavenly Man*, which can well hold all the Men 'that ever were in the World. So also in the same p. 142. N. 7. upon the words of Christ, *John.* 1. 51. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see Heaven Opened, and the Angels of God ascending and descending*

upon

upon the Son of Man; he ſays, 'This cannot be the external 'Perſon of Chriſt.) But if it was *not* the external Perſon or outward Body (as he ſays) of Chriſt that *John* ſpake of, in *Rev.* 1. much leſs was it a *Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones*; and leaſt of all doth *G. Whitehead*'s oppoſing the Baptiſts carnal notion of Chriſt's having a *Body* now in Heaven, of *Fleſh Blood and Bones*, and his being to come Viſibly again in that Body of *Fleſh, Blood and Bones*, deny Chriſts exiſtence in his Glorified Body without us. *G. Keith*, ſays, *Jo. Newman, here only uſes the word Body, to his coming again, and* G. Whitehead, *finds fault with that.* But in that *G. Keith*, ſlips, for *J. N.* uſed *not only* the word *Body*, but the words [that Body] to ſhew he meant a *Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones.* And it is well known, that many of the Baptiſts (as well as others of other Profeſſions) do hold the Body of Chriſt now in Heaven, to be as *really* and *materially*, *a Body of Fleſh Blood and Bones*, as it was, when upon the Croſs; which *G. Whitehead* might as well find fault with then, as *G. Keith*, did afterwards. He quarrels alſo with *G. Whitehead*, for citing the words of Chriſt, *John.* 14. 19. *Yet a little while, and the World ſeeth me no more.* Upon this, he carps at the Tranſlation of that Scripture, and ſays, It may be *better* Tranſlated [*as yet*] But I think it were *better* for him to let the Tranſlation alone as it is, which he cannot mend; for though he hath declared himſelf to be one in Opinion, with the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptiſts, Yet I ſcarce think he will find any among them, to be one *with him*, in *altering* the Tranſlation of that Scripture, at leaſt as he would alter it. Yet upon his confident altering the Text from [*no more*] to [*not as yet*] he ſays, *Does this prove that Chriſt has no Body at all? This is very bad reaſoning*, ſays he. Ay ſure, ſo it is. But who reaſoned ſo, beſides himſelf? Can he ſee no diffe-

rence between Christs not having *a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones*, and having no *Body at all*; he has a very bad sight then. When he formerly held, that the Body that was Crucified on the Cross at *Jerusalem*, is no more a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, did he urge that, to prove that Christ has *no Body at all?* If not, why will he infer so upon another, without cause? He alledges that *G. Whitehead brings that Scripture for a Proof, that those that Pierced Christ in his Body, shall not see that Body Visibly come again:* And thereupon he cries out, *Here is a Proof that Christ was Evanished.* But it must be again remembred, that that Body which the Baptist there contended for, and which *G. Whitehead* opposed him about, was a *Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones.* And therefore doth it not fall unavoidably upon *G. Keith*, that herein he holds that Body *only* of Flesh, Blood and Bones, which suffered death upon the Cross, to be the whole entire *Christ*; seeing he infers, that if that Body (of Flesh, Blood and Bones) which suffered death upon the Cross, be not now in Heaven, and to be seen come Visibly again, a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, *then Christ is evanished?* But it appears from *G. Whitehead*'s following words, that he did not believe Christ was *evanished*, but that he believed his *existence in a Spiritual glorified Body*, and that he should *so* come again, and be seen *of all*, though not in a Body of Flesh, Blood and Bones, or after a *carnal manner*. For he says (in the next words after, *John*, 14. 19.) 'But his second coming and appear-
'ance without Sin to Salvation, I own, and witness;
'and that he is therein to be seen Spiritually in his King-
'dom, and Fathers Glory, (which is an Invisible Glo-
'ry, *not seen Carnally*) Mark that. Howbeit his appea-
'ance shall be *universally seen*, both to the joy of the *Righ-
teous*, and universal Conviction, and Condemnation
'of the *Wicked*, who have rejected his Light within,
'and

'and his ſaving appearance thereby made manifeſt. 'Yea, every Eye ſhall ſee him (both of good and bad) "both thoſe that have waited for his ſecond coming 'without Sin to Salvation; and *they alſo which have* 'Pierced or Crucified him; which all thoſe in general 'are chargeable with, (as really as his Perſecutors that 'Pierced him outwardly) who profeſs his name, and yet 'Crucifie to themſelves his Life or Spiritual Appearance. 'He was Spiritually Pierced and Crucified in Spiritual '*Sodom* and *Egypt*, *Rev* 11. 8. The ſame Jeſus, as he 'was ſeen aſcend (when a Cloud received him out of 'their ſight, who ſtood gazing, *Acts.* 1. 9, 10, 11.) it is 'ſaid, ſhall ſo come in like manner, *&c.* Which tho' 'every like manner is not the very ſame, nor all 'Clouds the ſame, yet the ſame Jeſus certainly cometh, 'and in like manner, his coming being in the Clouds.

This ſame Objection *G. Keith*, had made againſt *G. Whitehead*, in his *Groſs Error*, p. 3. and again p. 6. In which latter place, reciting the foregoing words of the Baptiſt, *viz.* That thoſe that pierced Chriſt in his Body of Fleſh, ſhall ſee that Body viſibly come again, and part of *G. Whitehead*'s anſwer to it, he taxes *G. Whitehead*, with having blamed the Baptiſt for uſeing the word [Viſibly] with reſpect to Chriſt's comming again, and yet that *G. Whitehead*, in his late anſwer to ſome Queries, had uſed the word [Viſibly] with reſpect to Chriſt's Aſcenſion. Upon which *G. Keith*, there ſays, Now I am ſure there is the ſame ground in Scripture for his Viſible appearance and coming again, as there is for his Viſible aſcending. But let me ask G. *Keith*, (as ſure as he ſays he is) whether he then conſidered the great and wonderful change, which himſelf elſewhere hath often ſaid, was made in the Body of Chriſt, after it was taken up into glory; and then, Whether there is the ſame ground, either in Scripture or Reaſon, for the ſame manner of

Viſibility of his appearance and coming again in his glorified Body, as was of his aſcending before his Body was ſo glorified. The Body of Chriſt in which he ſuffered, (being an outward Fleſhly ſubſtance) was at the time of his Aſcenſion, as well as before, conſpicuous and viſible to the outward carnal Eyes, of outward carnal Men. But will it be in like manner Viſible to outward carnal Eyes, when he ſhall come again, now that it is ſo tranſcendently glorified, that it is become a pure, Heavenly, Spiritual, Glorious Body? Is there, according to G. *Keith*'s, Philoſophy, no difference, in point of viſibility, and with reſpect to the Opticks, and Organs of ſight, between a Body of Fleſh not glorified, and the moſt glorious of glorified Bodies? Is the one, with him, as perceptible by the Natural Eye, as the other? If not: Why was he ſo inconſiderately bold to ſay, I am ſure there is the ſame ground in Scripture for his viſible appearance and coming again, as there is for his viſible aſcending? If he underſtand the ſame manner of viſibility in his coming again, as was in his aſcending, he then makes no difference in point of viſibility between an unglorified and glorified Body. If he underſtand not the ſame manner of *viſibility* in each appearance, he does but trifle, quibble, & play the *ſophiſter*.

G. *Keith* cites two paſſages more, p. 18. out of the ſame Book of G. *Whitehead*, (Chriſt aſcended p. 24. and p. 69.) that in p. 24. he gives thus, Firſt, the Baptiſts words, *By denying any Perſonal being of Chriſt, without all men, at the right Hand of* God, *but only a fained Chriſt within, then remiſſion of Sins muſt die, and faith alſo, for want of the Object, Chriſt.* This G. *Keith* ſays, he looks on to be good *Doctrine*, tho' he cannot but know, that by a feigned Chriſt within, the Baptiſt meant that *Light within*, which G. *Keith*, confeſſes to be *Divine*. G. *Whitehead*'s anſwer he gives thus, *This manner of excluding* God's *right Hand, and Chriſt to a limitation out of his*

People

People in a Perſonal being (*which are no Scripture Terms*) *ſtill implies him to be a Perſonal God or Chriſt, like the* Anthropomorphite, *and* Muggletonians *conceits of him*: (This he caviled alſo at in his *Groſs Error*, p. 10.) to all which I anſwer; The word *Perſon*, or *Perſonal*, with reſpect to *God*, or the *God-head*, G. *Keith*, knows the Quakers always excepted againſt, as *unſcriptural*, and tending to beget or keep up *groſs* and *carnal* Conceits in People's minds, concerning God and Chriſt, as if they were like Men, having the *ſhape* and *appearance* of Men, and ſo were Circumſcribed and Limited to place, as Men are. And that it was againſt *ſuch a groſs Notion* as this, that G. *Whitehead* there contended, is manifeſt from his anſwer it ſelf. For he ſays, *This manner of excluding* God's right Hand, and Chriſt to a *limitation* out of his People in a *perſonal* Being (which are *no Scripture Terms*) ſtill implies him to be a *perſonal God*, or Chriſt, like the *Anthropomorphites* and *Muggletonians* conceits of him. The *Anthropomorphites* were therefore ſo called, becauſe they held God to have *the ſhape of Man*. Which extravagant notion *Muggleton* reſumed. And tho' G. *Keith* ſays, *There is no Church of England Man, Presbyterian*, or *Baptiſt*, &c. *That holds that notion, That the God-head has the ſhape of a Man*: Yet he is too ſlight to make a *Voucher* for *all* of thoſe Communions, tho' his *Et Cetera*, had been left out. Nay, he himſelf ſeems *doubtful* what to determine in that caſe for himſelf, ſaying, *What ſhape Chriſt's Body has now, that I leave*, Nar. p. 18. However, it is plain from G. *Whitehead*'s Book, both there and elſwhere, that it was *this notion*, and the aſſerting *ſuch a Perſonal exiſtence* of God and Chriſt, and in *unſcriptural* Terms, has tended to confirm that Notion, which G. *Whitehead* oppoſed both here, in p. 24. and in that other place, p. 69. cited alſo by G. *Keith*, where G. *Whitehead*, having expoſed his Opponents, Self-contra-

dictions (as one while saying, *Christ was remote from them, Christ doth not dwell in any Man, Christ in Person remote at the right Hand of* God, &c. And yet otherwhiles speaking of the *Indwellings of Christ by his Word and Truth, being of the same nature with him, and that Christ is setting forth himself to be the Vine, and his People the Branches*, and adviseth them,—*to abide in me, and I in you*, &c.) He makes this *Animadversion* thereupon, *If the Indwelling of God and Christ be such in his People, and the Saints in such near Union and Conjunction with Christ, as the Branches with the Vine, and Members with the Body, then 'tis false, and a lying Imagination, to Imagine either Christ, God, and his right Hand so remote, as not to dwell in any Man, no, not in their own People*; [*and these words Christ in Person, remote in his Body of Flesh*, &c. *And not in any Man*] *are not Scripture, but added*: *What strange Conceits and Limitations would* J. Newman *put upon the unlimitted God* (*like the Old Heretical Monks of* Egypt, *called* Anthropomorphites) *contrary to his own confession.* This shews it was not Christ's *Spiritual existence or being*, in a *Spiritual glorified Body* without us, That G. *Whitehead* opposed; but such a *carnal* Notion of a *Personal* being or existence of Christ, at the right Hand of God, as *confined* both Christ and God, to a *remoteness* from his People, and *excluded* them from being in his People. And therefore G. *Keith*, abused G. *Whitehead*, in telling his Auditors, that *by these words of* G. Whitehead, *All Papists, Church of* England *Men, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, who believe that the Man Christ has any Bodily existence in Heaven, as he thinks, are Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians*: For there is a *wide difference* between holding that Christ has *any Bodily existence* in Heaven, and that he has *such a carnal Bodily existence* in Heaven, as *excludes* him out of his People, and *confines* and *limits* both him, and God's right Hand, at which he is, to a *remoteness* from them. Which *gross* and

carnal

carnal Notion, G. *Keith*, not many Years ſince, ſeemed ſenſible of the hurt of, and writ againſt in his Book, called, *Ariſcious Appeal*, Printed at *Philadelphia*, in 1692. (ſince he began to quarrel with the Quakers.) In which he ſays, p. 11. 'We cannot approve of the too *carnal* 'Conceptions of many *carnal* and ignorant Profeſſors, 'that have *too carnal Imaginations* of Chriſt, and *confine* 'him altogether to ſuch a *Remoteneſs*, that they will not 'allow any meaſure of him to dwell in Believers, plain 'contrary to the Scripture. And in p. 24. he ſays to the *New-England* Profeſſors, 'How can ye Build 'on him, when ye have no belief, that Chriſt is nearer 'unto you, than in ſome *remote place beyond the Skies*? And yet now, in his *Enmity* againſt G. *Whitehead*, he charges him with denying *Chriſt*, for but oppoſing thoſe *too carnal Conceptions*, which ſome *carnal* and ignorant Profeſſors, in their *too carnal Imaginations*, had of Chriſt, whereby they would *limit* him to a *remoteneſs* from his People. This *limiting* Chriſt, by ſuch a *carnal Notion* of a Bodily exiſtence, as *excludes* him out of his People, and *confines* him to a *Remoteneſs* from them, if it be not now, was once an *uncomfortable* Doctrine to G. *Keith*, when he ſaid, 'Surely it is no leſs a *Comforta*-'*ble*, than it is a *true* Doctrine, that we have the Man 'Jeſus Chriſt *ſo near* unto us, in vertue of his *Divine* 'Life and Soul, in his *Divine Seed and Body* extended *into* 'us: And thus he is the incarnate Word, or *Word made* 'Fleſh, *dwelling in our Fleſh*, &c. *Way caſt up*, p. 133. And G. *Keith*, in his anſwer to the *Rector of Arrow*, ſaid, 'I put thee to prove, by any one place in all the 'Scripture, that Chriſt hath now **any other** Fleſh or 'Body, but that which is **Spiritual**, *Rector Corrected*, p. 24. and again, p. 54. 'As concerning the Body 'of Chriſt, that was Crucified, was it not again 'raiſed up to be made a living Body? And after 'he aroſe and aſcended, was it **not** a *Spiritual Body?*

'Why then (says *G. Keith* to the Rector) savst thou, 'shew a syllable, that intimates a *spiritual Body*? Is not 'Christ's Body a spiritual Body, which he hath now in 'the Heavens?—Shew a Syllable, that Christ hath *any* 'other Body, but that which is spiritual. And p. 55 he says, 'What is that Body of Christ, mentioned by the 'Apostle, *Col.* 2. 17. which puts an end unto the out-'ward Observation of Meats, and Drinks, new Moons 'and Sabbath-days? *Is that only the outward Body that* 'was Crucified? If thou sayst yea, then thou divideſt 'Christ, whereas Christ is not divided. And p. 44. he says, 'That there is not such a *distance* betwixt 'Christ, that is gone into the Holiest, and his Saints 'upon Earth, as thou imagineſt, see but *ver.* 19, 20, '21, 22. of *Heb.* 10. And in p. 23. speaking of the Power and Vertue of the Body of Christ that rose and ascended a spiritual and glorious Body, he says, 'But this vertue is *not any visible thing, nor is the* 'glorified Body of Christ visible *Flesh*; and therefore '(says he to the Rector) *thou doſt grosly erre, to say*, as 'thou doſt, *the Son of Man is* visible *Flesh*: For seeing 'the Body of Christ is glorified, and wholly spiritual '(as the Body of every true Believer shall be at the 'Resurrection) *how can it be* visible *Flesh?* And (adds he) 'Christ, the second *Adam*, is called in Scripture 'the *quickning Spirit*, but *not* visible *Flesh*. Therefore (says he) in this (see how he banters him) thou 'doſt grosly erre, and needeſt Correction. None of these Passages hath ever yet been retracted by *G. Keith* (that I have seen or heard of) and therefore he is the more to be blamed for blaming *G. Whitehead* for asser-ting Christ's Body to be a *glorified spiritual Body*, not *a gross, carnal visible Body of Flesh*, which he himself says it is not.

He hath *one Cavil more* upon this Head against *G. Whitehead*, and a *meer Cavil* it seems to be; He grounds it

it on a paſſage he takes out of a Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, called, *The He-goats Horn broken*, written about 36 years ago, in anſwer to two Books written by three Oppoſers, whereof one was named *Jo. Horn*; and *G. Keith* ſeems to fancy that this Book of G. *Whitehead*'s had that Title, as *alluding to the Name* of *John Horn*, and he took occaſion from thence to make himſelf and his Auditors ſome Sport about it, *Nar.* p. 19. But unleſs he had better ground to go upon than bare *likeneſs in ſound* of words, he may be miſtaken for all that. For I could ſhew him a Book, written ſome years before that, by *R. Hubberthorn*, called *The Horn of the He-goat broken*, in Anſwer to a Book publiſhed by one *Theo. Winterton*, betwixt which Name and Title there is not the leaſt likeneſs of ſound. That which G. *Keith* objects to G. *Whitehead* here, is, That he contradicts a paſſage in his Opponents Book, which G. *Keith* ſays, *if he underſtands any thing of true Divinity or Theology, is a ſound Paſſage*, viz. *That our Nature, Kind, or Being, as in us, not in Chriſt, is corrupt and filthy in it ſelf, yet Chriſt took upon him our Nature, not as it is filthy in us by ſin in it*, &c. How ſound this Paſſage is, I will not here diſpute, becauſe I would not dilate Controverſie to feed a *carping* Mind in a *peeviſh Adverſary*, neither will I preſume to queſtion *G. Keith*'s underſtanding any thing of true Divinity, leſt I ſhould be thought as *ignorant* as he is *arrogant*. But yet I think it may be worthy of conſideration, how far that Paſſage is ſound, which ſays, Our Nature, Kind, or Being is corrupt and filthy *in it ſelf*, (not only as in us, by *ſin in it*, but *in it ſelf.*) And how ſuitable it was for Chriſt to take upon him a Nature that was corrupt and filthy *in it ſelf*. That Chriſt took on him the Nature of Man, (though it be not in Scripture expreſt in thoſe terms, that I remember) may in *a right ſenſe* (for the word Nature is taken in divers Acceptations) be admitted: The Scripture ſays, *he took upon him the form of a Servant, and was made in the likeneſs of Men*,

Phil.

Phil. 2. 7. And that, *Forasmuch as the Children are Partakers of Flesh and Blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same*, Heb. 2. 14. And in verse 16. it is said, *He took on him the Seed of Abraham:* But the Margin expresses it (more agreeably to the Greek, as G. *Keith* knows) thus, *He taketh not hold of Angels, but of the Seed of* Abraham *he taketh hold.* Now I do not find by G. *Whitehead*'s Answer, that he denies that Christ took *Mans Nature*; but that he taxes his Opponents with Confusion, in two respects, one, for that they excepted against his former wording of their Assertion, thus, *That their Nature is restored in Christ*; and yet *that their Nature is a filthy Nature*, and *Christ took upon him their Nature.* The other, that, to free themselves from the imputation of Confusion in the former, they say, *He might as well have taxed the Apostle with Confusion, for saying, Men by Nature do the things contained in the Law*, Rom. 2. 14. *And yet by Nature Children of wrath*, Ephes. 2. 3. In which two places, G. *Keith*, I presume, will not deny the word Nature to be used *very differently.* Now to this G. *Whitehead*'s Answer was, *We may justly tax those with Confusion indeed, but not the Apostle; for here they cannot discern between the sinful Nature, and the pure Nature; for the Nature of Christ is pure, so that it's not their Nature, for their Nature is filthy, and therefore it is not in Christ* (that is, as it is filthy.) Then he goes on to shew their Confusion in the other part; *And their bringing that of* Rom. 2. 14. & Ephes. 2. 3. *together, to prove their confusion, sheweth that they cannot discern between that Nature by which Men do the things contained in the Law, and that Nature by which Men break the Law, and are Children of wrath; but make as if it were all one.* Now I do not find G. *Keith* is able to make any great advantage by his *Cavil* against G. *Whitehead.* He says indeed, *Our blessed Lord might well take on him our Nature, and the Nature in us be sinful, and in him pure and holy.* But will he say, that that Nature which our Lord took

took on him was *sinful* (or corrupt and filthy) *in it self*? Which he knows were *Jo. Horn*'s terms. But I observe he takes occasion from hence to *make Sport* with G. *Whitehead* and W. *Penn* their *Philosophy*, even so far as to *ridicule* Divine *Inspiration*: For he says, he *has oft told* G. Whitehead, *that he and* W. Penn *will needs embrace false Notions in Philosophy, they will needs seem to be Philosophers by Divine Inspiration, as well as Ministers and Preachers by it.* Had not the *Philosophy* himself so much *dotes* on, and glories in, been (as his own phrase was) a *Ditch*, and a *foul* Ditch too, he would have been more *cleanly* in his Expression, and not have made *Divine Inspiration* the Subject of his *Frothy Flout*. But it is high time for him to *tack about*, and deny Divine Inspiration, if he aspire to Preferment in that Church, against which he has formerly said so much for it.

Thus having answered all his Quotations against *G. Whitehead* concerning the *holy Manhood*, or *Divine Existence* and *Spiritual Being* of Christ in Heaven, as he is the *Heavenly Man*, & shewed that *G. Whitehead* hath not denied it, I shall give a few Instances out of G. *Whitehead*'s Books (those especially which G. *Keith* has pickt his *Cavils* out of) to manifest his owning the *Holy Manhood* or *Bodily Existence* of Christ in Heaven. In his Book called *The Light and Life of Christ within*, p. 9. refuting the slander of his Opponent, he says, '*False it is*, That the Quakers Christ is not 'Gods Christ, or that they deny the *Man Christ*, or the 'Christ that is in the Heavens. In his Book called *Christ ascended above the Clouds*, p 16. when his Opponent had asserted that *Christ cannot dwell in Man*; and given this as his Reason, *For Christ is perfect Man, as well as perfect God*: He does not deny that Christ is *perfect Man*, as well as perfect God, but denies the Consequence, that therefore Christ cannot dwell in Man. Mind his Answer, which is this: 'To say Christ cannot dwell in Man, doth 'not only oppose his Spirituality, Deity and Omnipo-

'tency;

'tency; but also is contrary to the Apostles plain Te-
'stimonies of Christs being *in* the Saints: And if he be
'perfect God, he can dwell in his People as he hath pro-
'mised; and surely *his being perfect Man* doth not put a
'Limitation upon him, as a Let or Hinderance to dis-
'able him from being in his People; whilst he who was
'Christ, as come in the Flesh, was also truly Jesus Christ
'within, in his spiritual Appearance; and we *do not con-*
'*fine him under this or that particular Name*. Again, p. 17.
'*I grant that Christ arose with the same Body that was crucis-*
'*fi'd and put to Death*, and that *he ascended into glory*, even
'the same glory which he had with the Father before the
'World begun. Many more Instances might be added;
But the Reader may take notice, that in my last Book
called *Truth Defended*, (written about a year ago, in
Answer to two Books of *G. Keith*'s, and which he hath
not yet replied to) I gave a dozen Instances out of those
Books which *G. Keith* has carped at, to shew that *G. White-*
head did own the Manhood of Christ; one of which (see-
ing he hath not taken notice of them) I may repeat here,
referring the Reader to p. 161. of that Book of mine for
the rest. That which I now repeat, is out of a Book
called *The Christian Quaker, and his Divine Testimony,*
Vindicated, Part 2. p. 97. where *G. Whitehead* saith, 'To
'prevent these Mens scruples, concerning our owning
'the *Man* Christ, or the *Son of Man* in glory, I tell them
'seriously, That I do confess both to *his miraculous Con-*
'*ception*, by the Power of the holy Spirit over-shadow-
'ing the Virgin *Mary*; and *to his being born of her, ac-*
'*cording to the Flesh*, and so that he took upon him a *real*
'Body (and not a fantastical) and that he was *real Man*,
'come of the Seed of *Abraham*; and that he in the days
'of his Flesh preached Righteousness, wrought Mira-
'cles, *was Crucified and put to Death* by wicked hands;
'that he was *buried*, and *rose again* the third Day, accor-
'ding to the Scriptures; and after he arose he appear-
'ed

'ed diverſly, or in divers forms and manners; he *really* 'appeared to many Brethren, 1 *Cor.* 15. and afterwards 'aſcended into Glory; being tranſlated according to the 'Wiſdom and Power of the Heavenly Father, and *is glo-* 'rified with the ſame glory which he had with the Father 'before the World began, *&c.* Is it not ſtrange, Reader, that *G. Keith* ſhould have the face to charge *G. Whitehead* with denying the *Manhood* of Chriſt, who hath ſo often and ſo plainly confeſſed to it? What elſe is this but to *pin* a wrong Belief upon a Man, to make him *ſeem erroneous*, whether he will or no? But this is worſt of all in *G. Keith*, who hath ſo often taken upon him to defend our Principles and Us againſt Oppoſers, in his former Books; And even but lately, in his *Serious Appeal*, printed in *America*, 1692. in Anſwer to *Cotton Mather* of *New-England*, having juſtified *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, in their Anſwer to *Hicks* and *Faldo*, ſays, p. 6. 'I do here ſolemnly charge *Cotton Mather*, to give 'us but *one ſingle Inſtance* of any *One* Fundamental Arti- 'cle of Chriſtian Faith denied by us, as a People, or by 'any *One* of our Writers or Preachers, generally owned 'and approved by us. And in p. 7. he adds, 'According 'to the beſt knowledge I have of the People called Qua- 'kers, and theſe moſt generally owned by them, as Prea- 'chers and Publiſhers of their Faith, of unqueſtioned 'Eſteem amongſt them, and worthy of double Honour, 'as many ſuch there are, *I know none that are guilty of any* 'one of ſuch Hereſies and Blaſphemies as he accuſeth 'them.——And I think (ſays he) I ſhould know, and 'do know theſe called Quakers, and their Principles, 'far better than *C. M.* or any or all his Brethren, having 'been converſant with them in Publick Meetings, as well 'as in *private Diſcourſes*, with the moſt noted and eſteem- 'ed among them, for about 28 years paſt, and that in 'many places of the World in *Europe*, and for theſe di- 'vers years in *America*. This more generally. But with

reſpect

respect more particularly to our owning the Man Christ, hear what he said in the Appendix to his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, 2d Edit. p. 133. 'And here (says he) I 'give the Reader an Advertisement, that although the 'Worlds Teachers and Professors of *Christ* in the *Let-*'*ter*, accuse us as *Deniers of Christ*, at least as Man, and of 'the Benefits and Blessings we have by him; yet that the 'Doctrine and Principles of the People called *Quakers*, as 'well as the People, do indeed more *acknowledge the Man* '*Christ Jesus*, and do more impute all our Blessings and 'Mercies that are given us of God, as conveyed unto us 'through him, unto *the Man Jesus*, than any of them all. And he gives the Reason too. 'Inasmuch, says he, as 'we do believe and acknowledge that a measure of the 'same Life and Spirit of the *Man Jesus*, which dwelt in 'him in its Fulness, and had its Center in him which then 'came in the Flesh, *&c.* is communicated unto us, and 'doth extend it self into our very Hearts and Souls, and 'whole inward Man; so that the *Man Jesus*, whom *Si-*'*meon* embraced with his Arms, according to the Flesh, 'is, according to the Spirit, our Light, and Life, and 'Glory. And (in p. 246.) thus I hope it may appear, 'how much more *we own Christ Jesus*, not only as *God*, 'but as *Man*, and that both inwardly and outwardly; 'for through the Measure of the Life of *Jesus Christ*, 'as Man made manifest in us, we have immediate Fellow-'ship and Union with the *Man Christ Jesus* also with-'out us, who is ascended into the Heavens. He has done, he says, as to the *Object* of Faith, at least at pre-sent; and so have I. Wherein I observe he charges not *W. Penn* at all *directly*, nor otherwise than as having owned those Books of *G. Whitehead*'s, out of which *G. Keith* pretends to prove his Charge. But before I follow him to his next Head. I would Note to the Reader, that all he hath said, or can say, against *G. Whitehead* or *W. Penn*, concerning their denying Christ, the

Object

Object of Faith, either as God or Man, he himſelf hath plainly and fully overthrown, by a Story he tells in p. 38. of his *Narrative*, where he ſays, that in the Year, 1678. three Perſons (whom he calls Quakers, but will not Name) did blame him for ſaying, it was lawful to pray to Jeſus Chriſt Crucified, and dared him (he ſays) to give an inſtance of one Engliſh Quaker that he ever heard pray to Chriſt. Whereupon (ſays he) *W. Penn* ſaid, I am an Engliſh Man, and a Quaker, and I own I have oft prayed to Chriſt Jeſus, even him that was Crucified. And he adds, that *G. Whitehead* to decide the Matter, took the Bible, and read, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *To all that call upon the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, both their Lord and ours.* This, it ſeems *G. Whitehead* did to prove the lawfulneſs of praying to Chriſt Jeſus, even him that was crucified. And this, (whether the Story in all its Circumſtances be true or no) proves beyond gainſaying, againſt *G. Keith*, that *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* were then ſound in the Faith, and of a ſound Judgment concerning the Object of Faith, Chriſt Jeſus, both as he was God and as he was Man. And that is enough to ſhew, both that the Charge it ſelf, of their denying Chriſt, the Object of Faith, is falſe; and that the Quotations *G. Keith* gives for Proofs thereof, out of Books of theirs (written moſtly about that time, or not long before) are perverted and wreſted by him to a Sence quite contrary to their Judgments, who writ them. And therefore ought not by a conſiderate and impartial Reader, to be regarded, or received againſt them.

He now comes to that which he calls the *Act of Faith*, or *the Vertue of Faith*, which he would have People believe has been denied, or contradicted by *W. Penn*, and for Proof refers (*Nar.* p. 19.) to a Book of *W. Penn*'s, called, *Quakeriſm a new Nick-name for old Chriſtianity*, written in 1672. in Anſwer to *John Faldo*, whom

whom *G. Keith* himſelf, within theſe four Years, called, *A moſt partial and envious Adverſary* (Serious Appeal, p. 60.) and mentioned *with Approbation* W. Penn's Anſwers to him, and in his Book, called, *The Chriſtian Faith*, &c. p. 6. refers his Reader thereto for ſatisfaction. The Words he now carps at, he takes out of p. 12. of *W. Penn*'s ſaid Book, where having ſet down *Faldo*'s Charge, that *Chriſtianity was introduced by Preaching the promiſed Meſſiah, and pointing at his humane Perſon; but Quakeriſm by Preaching a Light within*; G. Keith firſt tells us what he would have ſaid, if he had this to Anſwer, *viz. Any Quakeriſm* (ſays he) *I know of, that I learned, was introduced into my Heart both by believing in Chriſt without, and in Chriſt within, at once, and by one Faith.* Here he makes a *Tranſition* from *Preaching* to *Believing*, and from a *General*, to a *Particular*. *J. Faldo* ſhews how (in his Sence) *Chriſtianity* and *Quakeriſm*, ſo called (which, though one, he ſets in Oppoſition) came into the World; namely, *both by Preaching*: But that, by Preaching the *Promiſed Meſſiah*, and pointing at his *humane Perſon*; this, by Preaching a *Light within*. If it be true, which *G. Keith* ſays, that what he knew, or had learnt of Quakeriſm, was introduced into his Heart by Believing in Chriſt *without*, and in Chriſt *within* at *once*, and by *one Faith*: Yet certainly he hath formerly delivered himſelf much otherwiſe. And therefore, that he would have given that Anſwer which he now doth, had he been then to Anſwer *Faldo*, is very *unlikely*, ſeeing in a Book of his, called, *The Univerſal free Grace of the Goſpel aſſerted*, (Printed but the Year before, *viz.* in 1671.) he ſays, 'This is the *true* and **only** Method which ſhould be uſed 'by Preachers, for the bringing People into the *Faith* 'and *acknowledgment* of the Chriſtian Religion, **firſt**, 'to inform them of this *Univerſal Principle*, what it is, 'and turn them towards it, that *they may obſerve its Ope-*

'*ration*

'ration in them, as it appeareth against the Lusts of this 'World, and for Righteousness and Temperance: And 'so as wise Builders, to lay *this true Foundation* in its Pro-'per place; and as wise Husband-men and Planters to 'place *this Divine Seed*, where *it ought to be*, in order to 'its growth, that it may spring up in them, and the Life, 'Power and Vertue of God in it may be felt; And this 'will *naturally bring People* to own the Scriptures, &c. and '*to own Christ* in the Flesh, his miraculous Birth, his Do-'ctrine, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, Resurrection and 'Ascention, &c. p. 92. And thus, (says he again, p 93.) Men 'should be First turned towards this *inward Principle*, '*Light*, *Word* and *Seed* of the Kingdom, which being in 'them, and they coming to feel it there, they may the 'more readily be perswaded to own and believe it. And 'as they come so to joyn to it, that it springs up in them in 'the Light and Glory thereof, they will see and feel the 'Scripture, and the things therein declared, *to be of God*, '&c.——And this is *good Method and Order* in the prea-'ching of the Gospel. So that it is evident, saith he, '——that we have the *Best* and Only True *Method* in 'in our Words and Writings, First to turn People to 'the Light, that they may believe it,——and *then* to di-'rect them to, and inform them of the *Scriptures*, and '*things therein declared*; which they *cannot* receive, be-'lieve, or understand, but in the Divine Light. And in his Book called *The Way to the City of God*, (written in the year 1669, though not printed till 1678) p. 3. spea-king of Christs coming both *Outwardly* and *Inwardly*, he saith, 'The knowledge of this *Inward coming* is that 'which is the More Needful, and in the First place, 'as being that by which the true and comfortable use of 'his *Outward* Coming, is Alone sufficiently understood. And in p. 154. having said, 'That this is the Only True 'and *effectual* way of knowing the *Use* and *Work* of his '*Coming*, and *Sufferings*, and *Death*, in the *Outward*, by

'turning and having our Minds turned *inward* unto himself near and in our hearts, in the *holy seed*, to know 'by an *inward Feeling* and good Experience, his Doings 'and Sufferings in us, by being made conformable 'therennto. He adds, p. 156. 'And therefore, *This is* 'the *True Method and Order*, which we have found *great*'ly blessed of God, which the *Lord hath taught us* to hold 'forth unto People, whereby they attain unto Holiness, 'to a being made conformable unto the holy Life of Je'sus Christ, and come to know the true and great End 'and Use of his outward Coming, *viz.* **In the first 'place**, to point and turn their Minds unto the Light of 'Jesus Christ, who hath enlightened them and every one, 'and hath sown a Seed of his Light, Life and Spirit, in 'every one, unto which Seed they should give the most 'inward of their Hearts. The Reader may easily see the difference between *G. Keith then*, and *G. Keith now*. Now he says Quakerism was introduced into his heart, by believing in *Christ without*, and in Christ *within*, at *once*, and by *one* Faith. But then he told us, The *True* and **Only** *Method*, yea, not only the *best*, but the *only true* Method of Preaching, for the bringing People into the Faith and acknowledgment of the Christian Religion, is **first** (which word he repeats over and over, again and again) and **in the first place** to inform them of this Universal Principle (the Light within) so that they may believe it; and not only so, but may also *observe its operation in them*. This he then made the *Chief* thing, the *First* thing, the *First* step, (the Introduction) in the *right*, the *best*, the *true*, the *only true* Method and Order of Preaching the Gospel. And *then*, viz. *after* this inward Principle, this Light within, is preached, received, believed, and its operation within observed, than to direct them to, and inform them of the *Scriptures*, and *things therein declared*, which, said he, they cannot receive, believe, or understand, but in the Divine Light. So that whatever

ever he may now pretend he would have anſwered to *Faldo*'s Charge, (as he calls it) if he would have anſwered according to what he hath formerly writ, he muſt have acknowledged that Quakeriſm (as it is called) was introduced by Preaching the Light of Chriſt within, tho' *not in oppoſition* to Chriſts Appearance without, in that Body of Fleſh wherein he ſuffered; which *W. Penn* took particular care to expreſs.

Now let us again ſet down *Faldo*'s Exception, and *W. Penn*'s Anſwer to it, ſo far at leaſt, as *G. Keith* cites it. *J. Faldo* ſaid, *Chriſtanity was introduced by preaching the promiſed* Meſſias, *and pointing at his Humane Perſon; but Quakeriſm, by preaching a Light within.* To this, ſaid *W. Penn*, I anſwer, *That this is nothing injurious to the Quakers at all, but highly on their ſide; for had they preached a Chriſt now coming in the Fleſh, they had denyed his True, and only Great Viſible Appearance at* Jeruſalem, *which all true Quakers own* (let that be marked by the way) *ſince then they believe that appearance, and therefore need not Preach what is not to be again; and that the whole Chriſtian World beſides, have ſo long and lazily depended on it, without their Thirſting after his Inward Holy Appearance in the Conſcience*, &c. There *G. Keith* ſtops, and having made a falſe and envious Comment upon it, *p.* 20, he ſays, *But let me again read out the intire paragraph*, yet reads no more but theſe few words (being the imperfect part of a ſentence he read before) *Since then they believe that Appearance, but therefore need not Preach what is not to be again:* and there ſtops, ſaying, *There it clinches.* But with his leave, or without, I ſhall Tranſcribe more of *W. Penn*'s Anſwer, as what, I think conduces much to the opening of his meaning in this; for after he hath in *many particulars*, ſet forth the *Effects and Benefit* of Chriſt's *Inward, Holy Appearance in the Conſcience*; he adds, 'Since he has 'been ſo much talked of, and depended on, as to his then 'viſible manifeſtation of himſelf, *and ſo little*, if at all,

'*desired after*, as to his spiritual and invisible coming in-
'to the hearts of Men, to finish Transgression, and bring
'in Everlasting Righteousness; therefore God raised us
'up, and we are now gone forth into the World, to de-
'clare, That he is *spiritually manifested*, as then *fully* in
'that *Body*, so now *measurably* in the Conscience of all
'People, *a Divine Light*, reproving every unfruitful
'Work of Darkness: So that here is the *Mischief*, saith
'he, *the Malice* and Ignorance of our Enemies do us in
'this World, that because we speak so much of, and
'preach up and write for Christ's *Inward and Spiritual*
'*Appearance*, as a Light to Mankind, therefore they con-
'clude with a mighty confidence, that *we deny his*
'*outward Coming, Life, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension,*
'*and the Benefits thereof: O Darkness itself!* We have
'our Witness with the Lord of Heaven and Earth, that
'*we own him to be the Saviour General of the whole World,*
'*as to that Appearance, and that he obtained precious Gifts*
'*for Men*; but we say, (and our Adversaries have not
'wherewith reasonably to unsay it) that *First, the Divine*
'*Light, Life, or Power that shined through that blessed* Man-
'hood, was excellently the *Saviour*, and the *Manhood*
'but Instrumentally.—— And *Secondly* No Man or Wo-
'man in the World is savingly benefited by his *then ap-*
'*pearing as a Saviour*, &c. but as every such individual
'Person comes to *experience* his *Internal* manifestation,
'to convince, condemn, wound, heal, break, bind up,
'slay, make alive, in the *Nearness of the Spirit*. This is the
'state of *Right Redemption* and *Salvation*, and thus is he
'*particularly* a Saviour, and every such one is greatly be-
'nefited by him, as he was, in that *former Appearance*,
'the *general* Saviour of Mankind. Now mind how he
concludes, 'Behold then, O ye that are *Impartial!* how
'unworthily he hath *injured* us, to make People believe
'that we testifie to Christ's *Inward* Appearance, *in Oppo-*
'*sition to*, and *denial of his Outward*; *which is far from our*
'*hearts*,

'*hearts, ſo much as to conceive.* The like may well be ſaid concerning *G. Keith*, Behold, O ye that are *Impartial!* how *unworthily* he hath *injured W. Penn*, to endeavour to make People believe that he would have Chriſts Birth, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, *&c.* thrown over the Shoulder (as his Paraſe is) *given up*, and *buried in Oblivion* from Poſterity, which is the wicked Comment he makes upon, and falſe Conſequence he draws from *W. Penn*'s words, though far from *W. Penn*'s heart, ſo much as to conceive; and indeed far from his Practice too: For it is well known (and *G. Keith* himſelf cannot be ignorant) that *W. Penn* (as well as other Miniſters amongſt the Quakers) hath many times in Preaching commemorated the miraculous *Birth*, *Holy Life*, admirable *Miracles*, and moſt heavenly *Doctrines* of the *Man Chriſt Jeſus*, while he was on Earth, and pathetically ſet forth his *Sufferings*, *Death*, *Reſurrection*, and *Aſcenſion*, with the bleſſed *Effects*, and great and manifold *Benefits* that ariſe and accrue therefrom, unto all them that rightly receive him, believe in him, and obey him. So that had *W. Penn*'s Words been *ambiguous*, and liable, without *wreſting*, to ſuch a conſtruction: Yet ſince his *Known Practice* explained his meaning to be altogether contrary to what *G. Keith* would faſten on him, it was moſt *injuriouſly* and *unworthily* done of *G. Keith*, to ſuggeſt *ſo falſe* and ſo baſe a thing. But neither will *W. Penn*'s Words rightly taken, bear or admit it. For it muſt be conſidered, that as *J. Faldo*'s Objection againſt Quakeriſm (as he called it) lay in the *different* way or manner of *introducing* Chriſtianity of old, and Quakeriſm of later years: So likewiſe muſt *W. Penn*'s Anſwer thereunto be underſtood to relate to the way or manner of introducing each. Now touching the *Introduction* of Chriſtianity, *Faldo* ſaid it was by Preaching the promiſed Meſſias, and pointing at his humane Perſon. This related to the very time wherein he came, or when he was but

newly come, and it was the *main Controverſie* of that time, and that whereon the Minds of Men did *hang in ſuſpence*, Whether he who was then come, was *indeed* the *Meſſias* that was promiſed; and therefore it was more eſpecially needful at the firſt *Introduction* of Chriſtianity, to aſſert and demonſtrate that he who was then come, and did ſuffer on the Croſs, was indeed the promiſ d *Meſſias*. But it is no prejudice at all to Quakeriſm (ſo called) or to the Quakers, that, when the Belief of this had *generally obtained*, and was *held* throughout that part of the World which is called Chriſtian, they were raiſed up, and brought forth with a Teſtimony, not ſo *immediately* and *principally* to the *Outward Appearance* of Chriſt (the promiſed *Meſſias*) in that Body of Fleſh, at *Jeruſalem*, (*the Belief whereof was ſtill generally retained*) as to his *inward* and *ſpiritual Appearance* (and that too as the promiſed *Meſſiah*) by the inſhining of his Divine Light in the Hearts of Men and Women, the belief and knowledge of which was *well nigh loſt* in the World For it was as ſuitable and fit that Quakeriſm ſhould be *introduced* (or rather, that *Chriſtianity*) *Nick named Quakeriſm*, ſhould be *re-introduced*) into the World, by Preaching up that inward Appearance of Chriſt; which was to give it a *Re-introduction*, as *Chriſtianity* was at the firſt *introduced* by Preaching up that *outward* Appearance of Chriſt, which was then to give it its firſt *Introduction*.

Upon this Conſideration was *W. Penn*'s Anſwer grounded: For *Faldo* endeavouring to *unchriſtian Quakeriſm*, becauſe it was not *introduced* by Preaching the *ſame* Appearance of Chriſt, by which he ſaid Chriſtianity was *introduced* at firſt. To this I Anſwer (ſaid *W. Penn*) that this is nothing injurious to the *Quakers* at all, but highly on their ſide: For had they preached a Chriſt now coming in the Fleſh (or then newly come, which was done at the *firſt Introduction* of Chriſtianity)

ſtianity) they had denied his true and only great viſible Appearance at *Jeruſalem, which all true Quakers own.* They ha[d] not Chriſt to Preach *as now coming*, or *newly come, in the Fleſh*, as the firſt Promulgators of the Goſpel Diſpenſation had: But they had Chriſt to preach as *now come*, and *coming in Spirit, by his Divine Light in the Hearts of People*, which there was no need of his coming again in the Fleſh, to *re-introduce*. Therefore ſaid *W. Penn ſince they* (the Quakers) *believe that Appearance* (of Chriſt in the Fleſh at *Jeruſalem*) *and the whole Chriſtian World not only believe it, but depend* (though not rightly) *on it, and therefore they need not preach what is not to be again* (that is, they need not Preach that *with reſpect to the Aſſerting, Evincing, Proving, Demonſtrating*, or *Confirming* the *Doctrine* or *Meſſage*, which they bring, of the *inward* or *ſpiritual Appearance of Chriſt*. Not that it is not needful, that the Doctrine of Chriſt's Incarnation, Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, *&c.* ſhould be *ſtill* preached (which is the *unjuſt* and *malicious* Inference, *G. Keith* would draw from *W. Penn*'s Words) But that as it was not the *End of the Quakers being raiſed up as a People*, that they ſhould *only* inform the Chriſtian World, *that Chriſt*, the promiſed Meſſiah, *was come*, and *had ſuffered*, in that Body at *Jeruſalem* (of which the Chriſtian World (ſo called) hath through all Ages ſince, had at leaſt an *hiſtorical Knowledge* and *Belief*:) So ſince that was ſo *generally believed*, and was not to be *tranſacted over again*, in order to *introduce* his *ſpiritual* Appearance, there was no need *on that Account* (that is, for the aſſerting, or proving his ſpiritual Appearance) *to preach again his outward Appearance* (which was believed already) *until* his *inward* Appearance was preacht, received, believed in and ſubjected to; and *then* (which according to *G. Keith* himſelf, is the *beſt* and *only true* Method) to direct them to, and inform them of the Scriptures, and

the things therein declared, which he ſaid well, they cannot receive, believe, or underſtand (aright) but in the Divine Light. And this, he ſays, will naturally bring People to own the Scriptures, and things therein contained, to own *Moſes* and the Prophets,—and to own Chriſt in the Fleſh, his Miraculous Birth, his Doctrine, Miracles, Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, together with the wonderful End and Deſign of God therein, *&c. Univerſal Grace*, p. 92, 93. Beſides *G. Keith* might have read, p. 5. of *W. Penn*'s *Quakeriſm a new Nick-name*, &c. that *W. Penn* ſays, 'The outward Hiſtory of Chriſt's exceeding Love to 'Mankind, deſerves all humble and reverent Credit, as 'a Godly Tradition, and it ſhould *for ever* bind Men to 'receive, and fear, and worſhip him. This ſufficiently ſhews *VV. Penn* was not for having the Hiſtory of Chriſt's outward Appearance in the Fleſh, and what he did and ſuffered therein for Mankind, thrown away, and buried in Oblivion from Poſterity, but that it ſhould be preached, and kept in remembrance through all Ages, that it might bind Men *for ever* to receive, and fear, and worſhip him. So that *G. Keith* is doubly unjuſt, not only in perverting *VV. Penn*'s Words, but inferring that *VV. Penn* would have Chriſt's outward Coming, Death, *&c.* thrown over the Shoulder, given up and buried in Oblivion, when as not only *VV. Penn*'s Words laſt cited imply the contrary, but even upon *G. Keith*'s own Principle juſt before recited, the Preaching the inward Appearance of Chriſt (which he alſo ſays, according to the *only true* Method, ſhould be *firſt* preached) will naturally bring People to *own Chriſt in the Fleſh*, and the things declared of him in the Scriptures. But *G. Keith* is the more to be blamed for urging this againſt *VV. Penn* now, in as much as it is (with reſpect to the Subſtance of it) an Objection he hath formerly made, and to which I anſwered at large,

in

in a Treatiſe of mine, called, *An Epiſtle to Friends*, Printed in 1694. from p. 51. to p. 56. And again in another Book of mine, called, *A further Diſcovery*, Printed the ſame Year, from p. 93. to p. 98. Which latter is one of thoſe Books *G. Keith* hath not replied to.

He taxes *W. Penn* with uncharitable Dealing in ſaying above, *The whole Chriſtian World has lazily depended on it. Is there none*, ſays he, *in the Chriſtian World but the Quakers, that thirſt after the Power of God in their Souls? I was never ſo uncharitable to think ſo*, cryes he. But had he had either *Charity* or *Juſtice*, he would not have thought *W. Penn* by ſaying the whole Chriſtian World, intended *every individual Perſon* in the Chriſtian World. When the Apoſtle *John* ſaid, *The whole World lieth in wickedneſs*, 1 John 5. 19. Did he mean there was not *one Perſon* in the whole World, but what lay in Wickedneſs? When *John* ſaid, *All the World wondred after the Beaſt*, Rev. 13. 3. Did he mean *every individual Perſon* in the World? No ſure, the *Woman* that fled into the Wilderneſs, *Chap.* 12. 6. did not wonder after the *Beaſt*, for ſhe fled from the *Beaſt*. When *Mathew* ſays, The *whole City* came out to meet Jeſus, *Mat.* 8. 34. Did he mean, that there was *never a man nor woman* left in the City? *G. Keith* knows that that way of ſpeaking is *Figurative*, uſed *Synecdochically*, the greater part being taken for the whole. And in his *Serious Appeal*, in Anſwer to *Cot. Mather*, p. 9. he could urge that by way of Defence, ſaying, *The Denomination of a thing is taken chiefly from that which is the greateſt part*; and he might have taken it ſo here, had not *Enmity* had too great a part in him: For in p. 7. of the ſame Book, *W. Penn* mentions *Churches* (which is more extenſive than particular Perſons) *in theſe latter Ages, in whom there might once have been begotten ſome earneſt, living Thirſt after the inward Life of Righteouſneſs.*

This

This *G. Keith* might well have obſerved, for he makes another Cavil out of the foregoing part of this very Sentence, which was this, p. 6, 7. *The Diſtinction betwixt Moral and Chriſtian, the making Holy Life legal, and Faith in the Hiſtory of Chriſt's outward Manifeſtation, Chriſtianity*; (ſo it ſhould be read, the Words [*Chriſtianity* and *Manifeſtation*] being tranſpoſed and miſplaced in the Printing, as is obvious) *has been a deadly Poyſon theſe latter Ages have been infected with, to the Deſtruction of Godly Living, and Apoſtatizing of thoſe Churches, in whom there might once have been begotten ſome earneſt, living Thirſt after the inward Life of Righteouſneſs.* This Paſſage depends upon the *different Definitions* of Chriſtianity given by *J. Faldo*, and *W. Penn*. *J. Faldo*, it ſeems defining Chriſtianity, ſaid, *By Chriſtianity we are not to underſtand all thoſe Matters of Faith and Practice, which Chriſtianity doth oblige us unto.* This *W. Penn* excepted againſt, as reckoning that *All thoſe Matters of Faith and Practice which Chriſtianity doth oblige us unto, might well paſs for Chriſtianity.* Yet *Faldo* having granted that *Chriſtianity takes in whatever is worthy in thoſe Religions it hath ſuperſeded; yea, the very Heathens.* From thoſe Words *W. Penn* inferred, *This then does not make Chriſtianity a diſtinct thing in kind, from what was worthy, as he calls it, that is Godly, among either Jews or Heathen*: This is in p. 2, 3. of *W. Penn*'s Book called, *Quakeriſm a New Nick-name for Old Chriſtianity*; and having argued upon it in p. 4, 5, and 6. and ſhewed the hurt and miſchief that enſues upon *rejecting* Moral Vertues from being *any part* of Chriſtianity, he there concludes, in the Words *G. Keith* carps at, *viz.*, *The Diſtinction betwixt Moral and Chriſtian, the making Holy Life legal, and Faith in the Hiſtory of Chriſt's outward Manifeſtation Chriſtianity, has been a deadly Poyſon theſe latter Ages have been infected with, to the Deſtruction of Godly Living*, &c. As tending to perſwade People (too apt to be eaſily perſwa-

ded

ded to looſeneſs) that a *bare hiſtorical Belief* of Chriſt's outward Appearance in the Fleſh, is of *more value* and advantage to them, than a Vertuous, Pious, Godly Life.

To this *G. Keith* tacks another Proof (as he calls it) againſt *W. Penn*, and then makes his Reflection on both together. That other Proof he takes out of *W. Penn*'s *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, p. 118, 119. thus, *For it ſeems a moſt unreaſonable thing, that Faith in God and keeping his Commandments, ſhould be no part of the Chriſtian Religion: But if a part it be (as upon ſerious Reflection who dare deny it?) then thoſe before and ſince Chriſt's Time, who never had the external Law nor Hiſtory, yet have done the things contained in the Law, their Conſciences not accuſing, nor Hearts condemning, but excuſing them before God, are in* ſome degree *concerned in the Character of a true Chriſtian. For Chriſt himſelf preached and kept his Father's Commandments; he came to fulfil and not to deſtroy the Law, and that not only in his own Perſon, but that the Righteouſneſs of the Law might be alſo fulfilled in us*, Rom. 8. 4. *Now*, ſays *G. Keith*, *comes the main thing: Let us but ſoberly conſider, What Chriſt is, and we ſhall the better know, whether Moral Men are to be reckoned Chriſtians. What is Chriſt, but Meekneſs, Juſtice, Mercy, Patience, Charity and Virtue, in Perfection? Can we then deny a meek Man to be a Chriſtian? A Juſt, a Merciful, a Patient, a Charitable and a Virtuous Man, to be like Chriſt?* G. Keith ſays, *In this way of arguing there is a Fallacy. Theſe Moral Vertues*, he ſays, *are a part of a Chriſtian,—and belong to the* Genus *of a Chriſtian. But there are two things in the true Definition of a Man, the* Genus *and the* Differentia: *They have the* Genus, ſays he, *but not the* Differentia. And, I pray, which is of *moſt moment* in this Caſe, the *Genus*, or the *Differentia?* To have the Kind and *Nature* of a Chriſtian, or to have only ſome *outward Character*, or *diſcriminating Difference*, to diſtinguiſh a Chriſtian from a Child of God,

as

as namely an *historical Faith* of Christ's *outward* Appearance in the Flesh at *Jerusalem*? But since *G. Keith* allows these Moral Virtues to be *a part* of a Christian, he needed not on this score, have fallen so foul on *W. Penn*, for he might have observed in those Words himself has cited, that that which seemed to *W. Penn* so *unreasonable* a thing, was, That Faith in God, and keeping his Commandments, should be *no part* (that is, should by some be accounted *no part*) of the Christian Religion. And the Inference he made, from what he had offered to shew it was *a part* of the Christian Religion, was, that, *If it be a part* (he does not say, If it be *the whole*) *Then those before and since Christ's time, who never had the external Law or History, yet have done the things contained in the Law, &c. are in* some degree *concern'd in the Character of a true Christian.* But for that extravagant Inference *G. Keith* would draw from *W. Penn*'s Words, that a Man may be owned to be a Christian, and yet *disbelieve* that Christ is either God or Man, it carries in its front, *too evident Marks* of *Envy* and *Injustice*, to be regarded by any who bear not the *same Marks*. For did *W. Penn* there treat of *Jews*, *Mahometans*, *Pagans*? Or of such as have a *general Faith* of Christianity, but never adhered to any *particular* Party, as his express Words are in that 118. p. Nay, does he not there directly mention such as *believe in God and Christ*? For setting forth the Partiality and Cruelty of those professed Christians, who would *renounce a meer just Man their Society, and send him packing among the Heathen for Damnation*, he thus expostulates the Case, 'And 'pray, *What's the Matter?* Then subsuming the Person of an Opponent, he answers, 'Why! though this Per-'son be a *sober Liver*, yet he is but a *general Believer*; 'his Faith is at *large*: 'Tis true, He believes *in God*; 'but I hear *little* of his Faith in Christ: Then replies, 'Very well: Does he not *therefore* believe in Christ? Or

'must

'must he *therefore* be without the Pale of Salvation? Is 'it possible that a Man can *truly believe in God*, and be 'damned? But, adds he, 'As he that believes in Christ, 'believes in God, so he that believes in God, believes 'in Christ: For *he that believes on him that raised up Je-* 'sus from the Dead, his Faith shall be imputed to him for 'Righteousness, Rom. 4. 22, &c. And in p. 119. having enumerated several Moral Vertues, and alluding to the saying of Wisdom, *Prov.* 8. 15. *By me Kings Reign, and Princes decree Justice*; so may I say here, says he, 'By Christ Men are Meek, Just, Merciful, Patient, 'Charitable and Virtuous. And, adds he, Christians 'ought to be distinguished, by their *Likness to Christ*, 'and not their *Notions of Christ*; by his *Holy Qualifica-* 'tions, rather than their own *lofty Professions*, and in- 'vented Formalities. Does not this plainly shew, he treated there of those that professed the Christian Religion, preferring such of them, as in their Lives shewed most of Moral Vertue, and true Goodness, to the *highest Pretenders*, and most *flourishing Talkers* without it? But that which still falls heavy upon *G. Keith* is, that he should thus cavil at *W. Penn*, who himself (in his former Books not yet retracted by him) has so far out-gone *W. Penn* on this subject, and has also expresly extended Salvation by Christ to the *Gentiles*, or *Heathens*, *that knew nothing of him outwardly*. For instance, In his Book, called *Universal Grace*, p. 28. he says, 'There was such a Principle in 'them (speaking of the *Gentiles*) whereby they did the 'things contained in the Law. Therefore it was a 'Principle of the very saving Light and Life of Jesus 'Christ, which is that Divine Nature mentioned, '2 *Pet.* 1. 4. And in p. 29. he says, 'These *Gentiles* 'did the things contained in the Law, so that they 'were *excused*, yea and **Justified**, and did receive the 'Reward of Glory, Honour, and Peace in so doing. Again in the same p. he says, 'In divers of these *Gen-*

'tiles

'tiles the Seed was raiſed, which is that Divine Na-
'ture or Birth, by which they did the things contain-
'ed in the Law, and ſo were **Juſtified** by him who
'gave them Power to fulfil it. And in p. 30. Anſwer-
ing an adverſe Argument, which was this, 'There can
'be no Juſtification without Faith in Chriſt; but theſe
'*Gentiles* had not Faith in Chriſt, therefore, *&c.* He
ſays, 'I deny the ſecond Propoſition; for if they did
'cleave unto, and believe in the Light, they believed
'in Chriſt, for he is the Light; *nor is the outward Name*
'*that which ſaves*, but the *inward Nature*, Virtue, and
'Power ſignified thereby, which was made manifeſt in
'them; and thus is Chriſt even that τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ,
'that which may or muſt be known of God, *&c.* I could
multiply Inſtances of this kind, out of that and other
Books of his, if it were needful; but theſe at preſent
may ſuffice.

In p. 21. of his *Narrat.* he recommends to his Au-
ditory the Book, called, *The Chriſtian Quaker*, and ſo
do I to every Body, but with *different* Ends: He out of
ill-will, I out of *good-will*, to the Truth therein defen-
ded. He refers in particular to p. 125, 126, 127.
which Pages he ſays are beſtow'd to define what a Chri-
ſtian Quaker is; and he Objects, that *in all this large*
Definition, there is *not one Word of the Man Chriſt* (*who*
is God over all bleſſed for ever) *to be the Object, either of*
this Chriſtian Quaker's Faith, Love or *Homage.* That
which he calls a Definition of a Chriſtian Quaker, is
indeed an *Anſwer* to a *Queſtion* put by *Tho. Hicks*,
which was, *Who he, or they are, that obey the Light?* &c.
In anſwering which, *W. Penn* doth not ſo much med-
dle with *Faith* and *Doctrine*, as ſet forth the *Life*,
Practice and *Sufferings* of ſuch as truly obey the Light,
eſpecially in thoſe things wherein they are acted *diverſly*
from, or *contrary* to other People: It is therefore no
prejudice at all, (nor ought to be objected) either to

W. Penn

W. Penn or the *Christian Quaker*, that in that *Answer* to *Hicks's Question*, the *Man Christ* is not mentioned as the *Object of Faith*, &c. since the *Object of Faith*, &c. *is not there treated of*, but presupposed, and taken for granted. Yet *G. Keith* might have observed, that *Christ Jesus was there mentioned*, and that *with respect to his Manhood*: For in p. 125. The true Quaker, who obeys the Light, is represented to be one, 'That willingly 'drinks of the Cup of bitter Mockings, and yields to 'be baptized with the Baptism of deep Tryals *Christ* 'Jesus, his Lord, *drank of*, and *was baptized with*; which *Cup*, and *Baptism*, our Lord Christ took, and was *baptized* with, *as he was Man*. And there is also, in p. 127. a Testimony born to the Blood of Jesus Christ, and the Vertue of it, in these Words, 'So is 'the Light the Just Man's Path, that in every Age still 'shined brighter and brighter, in which the *cleansing* 'Blood of Jesus Christ is felt to cleanse from all Sin. And in *Quakerism a new Nick-name*, p. 5, and 6. *Sect.* 8. (out of which *G. Keith* pickt a Cavil but lately answered) he might have read these Words, 'Christianity 'then is not an *Historical Belief* of the *Exteriour* Acts, the 'true Christ *did* in that bodily Appearance (which is 'but *historical* Christianity)——But *a firm Belief in him* 'that so appeared, lived, died, rose and ascended, 'both as testified in the Scriptures of Truth, and more 'especially as he breaks in upon the Soul by his Divine 'Discoveries, as the true Light inlightning every Man. This (said *W. Penn* there) I call Christianity.

His next *Cavil* is concerning the *Mystery* of Christ, with respect to his coming *outwardly* in that Body, in which he suffered for Mankind at *Jerusalem*, and his coming *inwardly* in the Hearts of Men, working the Work of Regeneration *in them*. This he objected formerly, in his Book called, *The true Copy*, and I answered largely to it, in mine called *Truth Defended*, from

from p. 148. to p. 155. which he has not replied to. 'Tis true, he doth not begin his Cavil now with the ſame Quotation he did then; but (*for a blind.*) brings it in now with a Quotation of the ſame Matter in Subſtance, taken out of another Peice, *viz. A Preface to the Collection of* R. Barclay's Book (which he ſuppoſes, and I deny not, was writ by *W. Penn*) and then claps his former Quotation (out of *W. Penn*'s *Rejoyndr* to *Faldo*) behind it, to ſupport it, taking no notice that I had anſwered it before. This in him was neither Ingenuous nor Fair. He ſhould have anſwered my Book, before he had renewed the Charge therein anſwered. But inſtead of that, he conceals that it was already anſwered, and propoſes it as a new thing, as if it had not been anſwered before. Now, ſeeing he hath dealt ſo unfairly, I ſhall take the leſs notice of what he now ſays in the Caſe, but (that I may not *alium agere*) ſhall refer the Reader to my former Anſwer, in the Book and Pages abovementioned; yet not wholly paſs by what he ſays here.

Firſt, I obſerve he quarrels with *W. Penn* for ſaying (upon 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs, God manifeſt in the Fleſh*, &c.) 'And if the Apoſtle ſaid it of the Manifeſtation of the Son of God in 'the Fleſh, if that be a Myſtery (and if a Myſtery, it is 'not to be ſpelt out but by the Revelation of the Spi-'rit) how much more, *&c.* From hence *G. Keith* infers, *W. Penn doth not ſay it is a Myſtery, but he puts three Ifs to it.* This Objection is childiſh, in all but the Malice of it: For *G. Keith* knows *W. Penn* hath always acknowledged *that* Manifeſtation of Chriſt in the *outward* Body of Fleſh in which he ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*, to be a very great and *wonderful Myſtery*. And he, and every one elſe, that underſtands Words aright, knows, that the Particle *If* hath divers Significations, ſometimes it is *Conditional*, ſometimes *Dubitative*, ſometimes *Conceſ-*

Conceſſive, or Granting. Of which there are plenty of Inſtances in Scripture, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If by Grace, then no more of VVorks.* The Apoſtle there cannot be ſuppoſed to *doubt* or queſtion, much leſs to deny, that the Election is of Grace, for he *poſitively affirm'd* it in the verſe before. So *ver.* 12. *If* the fall of them (the *Jews*) be the Riches of the World, *&c.* how much more their Fulneſs? *ver.* 16. *If* the firſt Fruit, and *if* the Root be Holy, ſo the Lump, ſo the Branches. *ver.* 21. *If* God ſpared not the natural Branches, *&c.* 1 Pet. 4. 17, 18. *If* it (Judgment) firſt begin at us,—And *if* the Righteous ſcarcely be ſaved, *&c.* 2 Pet. 2. 4, 5. *If* God ſpared not the Angels that ſinned, but caſt them down to Hell, *&c.* And ſpared not the old World, but ſaved *Noah*, &c. Might not *G. Keith* as well have charged the Apoſtle with *denying* or *doubting*, that God ſpared not the Angels that ſinned, and the old World? Yet upon this, he asks, *Pray was our bleſſed Lord a meer Shell? Was he like the Shell of an Egg without the Meat of an Egg?* I anſwer no; He was *not* a meer Shell, neither was he *like* the Shell of an Egg, either without the Meat, or with it: For he was *full of Grace and Truth*, John 1. 14. *And in him dwelleth all the Fulneſs of the Godhead bodily*, Col. 2. 9. *For it pleaſed the Father that in him ſhould all Fulneſs dwell*, chap. 1. 19.

Again He asks, *Was there any Holineſs ever in any Prophet or Apoſtle, but it is like a Drop to the Ocean to what was in our bleſſed Lord?* If it were or could be leſs than a *Drop* to the *Ocean*, that affects not us in this Caſe: For we draw *no Compariſon* between the Holineſs that was in him, and that which is, or ever hath been, in any of the Saints, with reſpect to the *Degrees* thereof. Grant it to be the ſame in *Nature* and Quality, and it ſuffices, which a *Drop* is with the *Ocean*. But *G. Keith*'s Compariſon in his Marginal Notes in this p. 21. run higher in *Degree* than a *Drop* to the *Ocean*. For he ſays,

The ſame Seed and Life is in us which was in the Man Chriſt, and is in him in the Fulneſs, as Water in the Spring, and in us as the Stream; which is *more than a Drop*, and bears more proportion in *quantity* to the ſpring it flows from, than a *Drop* does to the *Ocean*. Again he ſays, *As the natural Life is in all the Members, but more principally in the Head and Heart, without any Diviſion; ſo this ſpiritual Life and Nature is both in Chriſt our Head, and in us, by which he dwelleth in us, as the Spirit of Man doth in the Body*. But is the diſproportion as great, in the natural *Body*, between the *Life* in the *Member*, and in the *Head* & *Heart*, as between a *Drop* and the *Ocean*?

He ſuggeſts, that *W. Penn compares the Work of Regeneration to the Incarnation of our Lord, ſo as to equal, yea, prefer it, with reſpect to Holineſs*, and thereupon ſays, *Nar.* p. 22. *I Appeal to you* (the Auditors) *whether is it not a moſt abominable Error, and whether it doth not make every regenerate Man not only equal to the Man Chriſt, but greater? for*, ſays he, *We truly value any Man as more Holy, according as the Manifeſtation of God is more in one Man than in another*. Now this is a great abuſe in him. For the Compariſon (if he will have it to be one) was not originally *W. Penn*'s, but his Adverſaries; and it lay *not between the Incarnation of Chriſt, and the Work of Regeneration*: But between the *difficulty of Believing the one, and Experiencing the other*. So *W. Penn* underſtood *J. Faldo* at firſt; and thereupon ſaid, 'Regeneration 'is a ſlight thing (meaning with *J. Faldo*) in Com-'pariſon of the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh. (Mark that) He did not ſay, in Compariſon of Chriſt after the Fleſh: But in Compariſon of the *Knowledge* of Chriſt after the Fleſh. And thereupon he added, 'The Hiſtory is made (*viz.* by *J. Faldo*) the great-'eſt Myſtery: And to *believe* the one, matter of great-'er difficulty, than to *Experience* the other. *Rejoynder*, p. 336. The Compariſon here lay not between the *Dignity* or *Excellency* of Chriſt's *Incarnation* in that Body which

which he took of the Virgin, and his *ſpiritual Formation* and Birth in his Saints (which is intended in the Word [*Regeneration*:] But between the *difficulty* of *Believing* the one, and of *Experiencing* the other. Neither would the Compariſon between the Incarnation of our Lord Chriſt, and the Work of Regeneration (had ſuch a Compariſon been made) have been with reſpect to the *Degrees* of *Holineſs* in each: But with reſpect to the *greatneſs of the Myſtery* in the one, and in the other, which depended not *ſimply* upon the *Holineſs* in either. For though this Myſtery of the Incarnation of Chriſt, be by way of *Emphaſis*, or *Excellency*, to diſtinguiſh it from other Myſteries, called by the Apoſtle, *The Myſtery of Godlineſs*, as being a *great part* of that great Myſtery: Yet it is not properly called a Myſtery from the *Perfection of Holineſs* that was in him; but from the wonderful and *miraculous* Manner of his *Conception*, &c. not eaſily to be apprehended by humane Underſtanding. In which ſenſe alſo, and for which Reaſon, the *ſpiritual Union* betwixt *Chriſt* and his *Church*, is by the ſame Apoſtle called, *A great Myſtery*, Eph. 5. 32. And in 1 *Cor.* 15. 51. The Apoſtle treating of the *Reſurrection*, ſaith, *Behold, I ſhew you a Myſtery, we ſhall not all ſleep, but we ſhall all be changed.* The Myſtery here lay not in the point of *Holineſs*; but in the *ſtrangeneſs* of the thing, that whereas the general Change is made by Death, ſome ſhould be changed without dying. We ſhall not all *Sleep*, (that is, we ſhall not all *Dye*; *Sleep*, in this Senſe, being a *Synonima* of *Death*, Dan. 12. 2. John 11. 11. and 14. Acts 7. 60. and 13. 36. 1 Theſſ. 4. 14.) but we ſhall all be *changed*. So that the plain import of *W. Penn's* Words is but this; Seeing the Incarnation of Chriſt, which was his outward Appearance in the World, being outwardly born of, and brought forth by a Virgin, was called a Myſtery, becauſe of the extraordinary and ſupernatural

tural Way and Manner of his Conception: Much more may the Work of Regeneration, Christ's being formed in the Saints, *Gal.* 4. 19. (So that according to *G. Keith* himself, they are his Mother that bring him forth by a Spiritual and Divine Birth, *Mat.* 12. 49. *Way cast up*, p. 111.) be called a Myſtery, ſeeing it is wholly inward and ſpiritual in its Operation, and conſequently more remote from outward Senſe, and harder to be comprehended by humane Underſtanding. In which *W. Penn* would not in any reſpect, leſſen that great and glorious Work of God in the Incarnation of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt: But would exalt the glorious Work of Chriſt in his Saints. And as plain alſo it is, that the Scope and Drift of thoſe Words of *W. Penn* both here, and in his *Rejoynder* to *Faldo* (which I have Anſwered elſewhere) was to perſwade People not to reſt *barely* in an *hiſtorical* Belief of Chriſt's Incarnation, and Manifeſtation in that Body of Fleſh, wherein he ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*, and obtained Redemption for all them that ſhould lay hold on him by a living Faith: But to *come to that living Faith*, that thereby they might *experimentally* know, and witneſs the great Work of *Regeneration*, to be wrought in them, Chriſt to be *ſpiritually formed* in them, and to dwell in their Hearts by Faith; without which, the moſt exact literal Knowledge of the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Incarnation, Sufferings, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, will ſtand them in no ſtead, but add to their Condemnation.

He taxes *VV. Penn* with *thinking it is a matter of little or no difficulty to believe, that God ſent Chriſt to die for Sinners, and to reconcile God to Men by his Death.* How little of difficulty there is in *barely* and *hiſtorically* believing this, the *Common Faith* of all that part of the World called Chriſtian ſhews, wherein *all Profeſſions*, and the *moſt profligate* and prophane in any Profeſſion, doth *ſo* believe it. And though *G. Keith* talks of a *true ſaving Faith*,

Faith, and ſays, Nar. p. 23. *None of all the Church of* England *Men, Independents*, or *Presbyterians, ſay, the meer Hiſtorical, Literal, Traditional, Faith of Chriſt, will ſave any:* Yet I think it may, without breach of Charity, be doubted, that *too many* in *ſome*, at leaſt, of thoſe Profeſſions, have *no other*; and certain it is, *W. Penn*'s words related chiefly to *ſuch:* For he ſays, in the place quoted by *G. Keith*, At this rate the LORD, *Lord-Crier* is highly priviledged, alluding therein to the words of Chriſt *Mat. 7. 21. Not every one that ſaith unto me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven: But he that doth the Will of my Father which is in Heaven.* From which, and his Anſwer in *v.* 23. Then *will I profeſs unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work Iniquity*; It is evident that theſe knew not him *aright*, nor had *true* Faith in him, notwithſtanding their *high pretences*, of having Propheſied, caſt out Devils, and done many wonderful things in his name, *v.* 22.

Again, *G. Keith*, ſays, p. 23. *The matter is, there is a ſaving Faith of Chriſt without us*; there he ſtops, as to ſaving Faith, but too ſhort: For Faith *of* Chriſt *without* us, (i. e. a *Belief* of all Chriſt did and ſuffered in that outward Body, which he took of the Virgin) without Faith in Chriſt *within* (i. e. a *receiving Chriſt* by Faith *into the Heart*, to *cleanſe* the Heart, and by his precious Blood to *purge* the Conſcience from dead works, to ſerve the living God) will not prove a *ſaving* Faith. Then he goes on, ſaying, *And Chriſt without us, as he is both God and Man, the Emanuel, as well as his inward Appearance in us, is the Object of ſaving Faith; but theſe Men would not own it.* If by theſe Men he means, either the Quakers in *general*, or any of *thoſe* he has traduced by name, *his Charge is falſe.* We own Chriſt *without*, as he is both God and Man, joyntly and together with his *inward* appearance in the Heart, to be the *Object* of ſaving Faith to all thoſe, to whom

the knowledge of his *outward* Appearance hath come. But inasmuch as a great part of Mankind hath not the Knowledge of that *outward* Appearance of Christ, and what he therein did and suffered; Christ *without*, with respect to his Manhood, and what he did and suffered in that prepared Body, cannot be the *Object* of Faith to *such*, until revealed to them. And therefore if *G. Keith*, will *yet* admit that such have been, or may be *saved*, (and consequently that they had, or may have *saving* Faith, without which none can be saved, because, *Without Faith it is impossible to please God*, Heb. 11. 6.) he must grant the *Object* of *their* Faith to be, not that *outward* Appearance of Christ in the Flesh, but his *inward* Appearance and Manifestation in and by his Divine Light, Life, Word, and Power, in *their Hearts*. I say, if he will *yet* admit it, because he has of late so *turned* and wheel'd about from his former Principles, that one knows not where to find him. In his *Way to the City of God*, p. 125. he said, 'Even at Man's Fall, 'the *Seed* of the *Woman* was given, not only to bruise 'the *Serpents* Head, but also to be a *Lamb*, or Sacrifice, 'to attone and pacifie the Wrath of God towards Men. 'And this is the Lamb, that was slain *from the beginning* 'of the World. And through the coming of Jesus Christ, 'thus in the *inward*, even *before he was outwardly come*, 'or manifest, **many were saved**, and attained unto '**perfect Peace and Reconciliation** with God in 'their Souls, yet not in *unholiness*, but in departing there-'from, and becoming Holy and *Sanctified* unto God. In p. 152. of the same Book, in Answer to a Question, Whether the *knowledge* of the *outward* coming, sufferings and Death of Christ, is not of *absolute necessity* unto every one? He says, 'Though *express knowledge* of his 'outward coming, sufferings and Death, is very pro-'fitable to beget Faith and Love in Men towards God, 'as aforesaid, and ought to be highly valued in its place.

Never-

'Nevertheleſs, this *expreſs knowledge*, is not of *abſolute* '*neceſſity* unto Faith and Love, *&c.* And in p. 153. 'How many *thouſand* have been *ſaved* before Chriſt's 'coming in the *outward*, who knew it not *expreſly*? And a little lower, 'Seeing then that ſome had Faith and 'Love to God, and were *ſaved*, without the expreſs '*knowledge* thereof (to wit, of Chriſt's coming in the '*outward*) *before he came outwardly*, why not alſo *after his* '*coming*, where his coming outwardly hath not been 'preached nor revealed?—For now Chriſt is *inwardly* 'come in a Seed of Life and Light, in all, which is the 'Word of Reconciliation, *by which men may be Reconciled* '*with God*, as they joyn and apply their Minds there-'unto. Such paſſages as theſe abound in his former (*not yet retracted*) Book, which it would be tedious to tranſcribe. Yet inaſmuch as he ſays here (Nar. p. 23.) that *though Regeneration is no ſlight thing, yet comparing Chriſt's Incarnation with the Work of Regeneration, I do affirm the Work of Regeneration is a light thing, tho' not light in it ſelf*; I will ſhew him (though it be ſome what beſide the preſent Buſineſs) how much he formerly prefer'd the *inward* Appearance, and Manifeſtation of Chriſt in Spirit, to his *outward* Appearance in the *Fleſh*. In his Book called *Immediate Revelation not ceaſed* (nor retracted) p. 59. he ſays,—'If his *Bodily* preſence 'was *not ſufficient* to the Church, his teaching them out-'wardly by word of Mouth, Face to Face; but he ſaid, 'It was expedient that he ſhould go away from them, 'and he would ſend *another* Teacher, who would do '**greater** things, and **more** Manifeſtly and **Gloriouſly** 'reveal unto them God, and the things of his King-'dom: If Chriſt's *Bodily* preſence in the Fleſh, was not '*ſufficient* of it ſelf, to Miniſter, though he ſpake as ne-'ver Man ſpake, yet I ſay, If *this* Miniſtration was *not* '*ſufficient*, but a **more Glorious** they were to expect; 'and as they waited, they witneſſed it fulfilled, and

'come unto them: Then far less is the outward Administration of any other Man, *&c.*—Seeing the knowledge of Christ after the *Flesh* was *not sufficient*, not to be rested in; but they were to look for a **better**, a **more clear**, and **full** manifestation in themselves, he appearing in a Spiritual, Glorious, Heavenly, **Mysterious** way in their Hearts *&c.* And in p. 120. having cited before many Scripture-sayings out of the Old and New Testament, Concerning Christ, he says, 'All these Glorious things both he, in the Days of his 'Flesh, and the Prophets, before that his appearance in 'that Body of Flesh, declared, neither **only** nor **principally**, concerning his coming in the *Flesh*, (namely, 'in that *Vessel* or *Temple* which appeared at *Jerusalem*) 'but mainly and principally concerning his *Spiritual* 'Appearance *in* his Saints, *after* his being Crucified, 'Risen and Ascended; *for till then*, the Son of Man 'was not *Glorified*. And though he was *Bodily* present 'with his Disciples, yet he told them, they were to see 'greater things.—And p. 121. He told them, It 'was expedient he should go away, that he might come 'again in a **more Glorious** and **Comfortable** Appearance, by the Revelation of his Glorious Power *in* 'their *Hearts*, for his Kingdom was not of this World, 'but an *inward* Kingdom, and he said, that *it was within*; and pointed to *this Spiritual* Appearance, by his 'Light in their Hearts, under many Parables and Figures, *&c.* Again, p. 107. he says, 'The *Jews* and 'People of *Israel* who lived in *Moses*'s time, and were 'saved, it was through Faith in *this* Word, in *this* Prophet, raised up *in* them, *in* their Hearts, *not at a distance*, but nigh; *the Word is nigh in thy Heart*. And 'this is Christ in them, the hope of Glory, the Mystery hid from Ages and Generations, but was ever made 'manifest *in* his Saints, but in the latter Days **more clearly**; Christ *in* all that believe, the hope of Glory.

Does

Does he not here plainly make that *Mystery* which the Apostle (and he from him) calls the Mystery *which hath been hid from Ages and from Generations*, Col. 1. 2. 6. to be the *inward Appearance* of Christ, the hope of Glory, in all that believe, and says, *It was ever made manifest in his Saints.*

He pretends, Nar. p. 23. to have some other *principal* Proofs remaining about this *Gross Error* (as he calls it) of *W. Penn:* But he brings forth but one (that I find) and that the same which he charged formerly, in his Book called *The True Copy*, &c. And which I answered at large in my Book called *Truth Defended*, from p. 113. to p. 123. Of which he takes no notice. Had he been either *fair* or *manly*, he should first have *refuted* the former Answers, before he had renewed his Charge. Yet not only here, but in his *Gross Error*, p. 18, 19. he repeats this same Charge, without so much as owning that it had been answered to before. So that, with respect to him, it is to little purpose to answer at all, since he has so *little honesty*, as to *wink* over the answer, and repeat his Charge a new, as if there had been nothing said to it. But for the *undeceiving* of them, whom he labours to deceive, and by *false* Accusations and *Calumnies*, to bring into a *dislike* of our Principles and us, I shall here *wipe off* some of his *Abuses*, and refer the Reader, for further satisfaction, to my former Book called *Truth Defended.*

The Quotation he now gives, is out of a Book called *The Christian Quaker*, p. 97. 98. It is a *Controversial* Book, and the Controversy in that part of it is, *Whether Christ, as Christ, was before he took Flesh of the Virgin*, or no? Which the Adversaries *denied*; *W. Penn affirmed*, and gave many Arguments, from Scripture and Reason, to prove it, which the Reader may there see at large from p. 92. to p. 99. Amongst those many Arguments, one was drawn from the *promised Seed*, which all acknowledge to be Christ, and therefore, as a

fit

fit *Medium* was uſed by *W. Penn*, to prove that Chriſt, *as Chriſt*, was *before* he took that Body of Fleſh upon him; and therefore that *that* Body, *ſimply conſidered* as a *Natural* Body (which was the Notion the Adverſaries had of it, and from whence they Spake ſo much of Chriſt's *Humane Nature*) was not *properly* the Chriſt, but he (*moſt properly*) who was the Heavenly *Spiritual* Man, who came down from *Heaven*, and took upon him that *outward* Body; in as much as the *Seed* is a *Spiritual* Subſtance.—Now to prove that the *Seed* is *inward* and *Spiritual*, he argued thus (which is the paſſage G. *Keith* quotes.) 'As *Abraham outward* and *natu-* 'ral was the great Father of the Jews *outward* and *na-* 'tural, whoſe *Seed* God promiſed to Bleſs, with Earth- 'ly Bleſſings, *&c.* And that they were *Figurative* of 'the one *Seed* Chriſt, and ſuch as he ſhould beget unto 'a lively hope, *&c.* it will conſequently follow that 'this *Seed* muſt be *inward* and *Spiritual*; ſince one out- 'ward thing cannot be the *proper* Figure or Repreſen- 'tation of another: Nor is it the way of holy Scrip- 'ture ſo to teach us; the *outward* Lamb ſhews forth the 'inward Lamb; the Jew *outward*, the Jew *inward*, *&c.* '—'I have theſe two ſhort Arguments to prove what 'I believe and aſſert, as to the *Spirituality* of the true 'Seed; and a clearer overthrow it is to the Opinion 'of our Adverſaries, to the true Chriſt. Firſt, *Every* 'thing begets its like; what is *Simply Natural*, produces 'not a *Spiritual* being, *Material* things, bring not forth 'things that are *Immaterial*. Now becauſe the *Nature*, 'or *Image*, begotten in the Hearts of true Believers, 'is *Spiritual*, it will follow, that the *Seed* which ſo 'begets, and brings forth that *Birth*, muſt be the ſame 'in *Nature*, with that which is begotten, therefore 'Spiritual; then Chriſts Body, of what he had from the 'Virgin, *ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch*, was not the Seed. 'Secondly, It is clear from hence; The *Serpent is a*

Spirit;

'*Spirit*: Now nothing can bruiſe the *Head* of the *Ser-*
'*pent*, but ſomething that is alſo *Internal* and *Spiritual*,
'as the *Serpent* is; But if that Body of Chriſt were
'the *Seed*, then could he not bruiſe the Serpents Head
'in all, becauſe the Body of Chriſt is not ſo much as
'in any one, and conſequently the *Seed* of the *Promiſe* is
'an Holy and *Spiritual* Principle of Light, Life and
'Power, that being received into the Heart, bruiſeth
'the *Serpent's* Head. And becauſe the *Seed*, which
'cannot be that Body, is *Chriſt*, as teſtify the Scrip-
'tures, the Seed is *one*, and that Seed *Chriſt*, and Chriſt
'*God* over all, Bleſſed for ever; we do conclude, and
'that moſt truly, that *Chriſt* was, and is the *Divine*
'*Word* of Light and Life, that was in the *beginning*
'with God, and was, and is God over all, bleſſed for
'ever. And that this may yet more evidently appear,
'let it but be ſeriouſly weigh'd, that *before ever that*
'*viſible Appearance was*, the *Seed bruiſed*, in good Mea-
'ſure, the *Serpent's Head* in the Holy Men and Wo-
'men of all Generations, otherwiſe they had not been
'Holy but Serpentine and Wicked; And if the Seed
'was before, and that Seed be Chriſt; becauſe there is
'but *one Chriſt*, as well as but one only Seed, it doth clear-
'ly follow, that *Chriſt was Chriſt*, *before that outward*
'*Appearance*. Which was the thing intended to be
'proved. Upon this *G. Keith* ſays, *W. Penn will needs*
have this to be not Chriſt without, but Chriſt within. But
W. Penn neither ſaid ſo, nor meant ſo. He does not
deny the Seed to be Chriſt without. He ſays, the Seed
Chriſt is Spiritual and *inward*, that is, *in Man*; which
doth not hinder, but that it may be and is *outward* alſo,
that is, *out of Man*, or elſewhere, beſides in Man; but
that, whether inward or outward, it is a *Spiritual* Sub-
ſtance. Yet as it is a Seed bruiſing the Serpent's
Head *in Man*, it is *inward*, working againſt the Serpent
in the Heart, where the Serpent puts up his Head, to
deceive

deceive and defile the Heart of Man, and draw him from his Duty and Obedience to God. And indeed, in that great and *moſt Eminent* Encounter between the two Seeds, when the Divine Seed had taken on it outward Fleſh, and ſo was born of the Virgin, (with reſpect to which he was Denominated, and was the Seed of the Woman, and ſo of *Abraham*, and *David*, (of whoſe Seed ſhe was) though the Serpent could not aſſault him, from any thing in himſelf (*having nothing in him*, John. 14. 30.) Yet it was the Divine Word or Power which is called the Seed in Man (the *ſame* which had bruiſed the Head of the Serpent, in *Mary*, *David*, *Abraham*, and all the Holy Men and Women before) *inwardly* dwelling in that *Immaculate* Body, by which he *repelled* the aſſaults of the Tempter, broke the Power of the *Prince of Darkneſs*, vanquiſhed and put him to flight, and Triumphed moſt Glorioufly over him.

Again, *G. Keith* ſays, p. 24. *So the Paſchal Lamb was no Figure of Chriſt without. And when* John *ſaid*, Behold the Lamb of God! *It was meant of Chriſt within us, not of Chriſt without us, for our Paſſover is Slain for us.* This *G. Keith* ſets down, as if they were *W. Penn*'s words, and accordingly they are Printed, with Coma's in the Margin, as the Quotations out of *W. Penn*'s Books are. And then *G. Keith* ſays upon it, *You ſee, according to* W. Penn, *that Paſſover that was ſlain for us, was ſlain in us, not without us: And ſo they throw away our Arguments againſt the Jews.* But this is an Abuſe in *G. Keith*. The words he gives before, as *W. Penn*'s, are *not W. Penn*'s, but *G. Keith*'s *unfair inference* from *W. Penn*'s words. *W. Penn* did not ſay the Paſchal Lamb was no *Figure* of Chriſt without. He ſaid the *Outward* Lamb ſhews forth the *Inward* Lamb; the Jew *Outward*, the Jew *Inward*. And doth it not ſo? And when *John* ſaid, *Behold the Lamb of God*, *W. Penn* doth not ſay, It was meant of Chriſt within us, *not of Chriſt without*

without us: For Christ *within us*, and Christ *without us*, is but one Christ, *not two* Christs, nor divided. But when *John* said, *Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the Sins of the World*! Did he mean *the Body only*, or *Outward* Manhood of Christ? Or did he not mean *more especially* that Divine and Heavenly Manhood, which then dwelt and appeared in that Body, with respect to which he was called Christ, long before he took on him that Body, and is said to be *the Lamb slain from the Foundation of the World*, Rev. 13.8. It is not then according to *W. Penn*, that the Passover that was slain for us, was slain *in us, not without us*; but it is according to *G. Keith*'s *perverse* Inference: For the Passover that was slain for us, *was slain without us*; but it was not *only an Outward* thing, or the *Body only*, which was taken of the Virgin, that is designed under that name of the *Passover*, but that *Son of Man* who came down from *Heaven*, and took upon him that Outward Body, and suffered in that Body, and so became a part, yea, a *chief* part of that Blessed Sacrifice, although it was the *Outward Body*, or Manhood *only* of Christ our *Spiritual Passover* (as he is called, *Wilson's Christian Dictionary*, *verbo* Passover) that in a *strict* and *proper* sense was said to be *slain*.

Next he quarrels with *W. Penn*'s *Logick*, in saying, Then Christ's Body, he had from the Virgin, *strictly considered as such*, was not the Seed. *This is rare Logick*, says G. Keith. *Here's a Fallacy, but I believe* (says he) *it proceeds not from any design, but from his weakness in Logick.* (But the *Abuse* he would put upon *W. Penn*, proceeds I fear, not so much from his *weakness in Logick*, as from an evil *Design* in him) He adds, *You know, there should be no Term, nor thing of Importance, in the Conclusion of any Syllogism or Argument, but what should be in the Premises*; *but* strictly considered *is not in the Premises, therefore it should not be in the Conclusion.* Had he minded

minded the *Premiſes* better, he might have ſeen, that though thoſe very Terms [*ſtrictly Conſidered*] were not *expreſly* in the *Premiſes*, yet *equivalent* Terms were; namely, the Terms [*Material*, and *ſimply Natural*,] (which laſt yet was uſed only *ad hominem*, upon the Adverſary's Opinion) therefore *G. Keith* might well have ſpared his *Flurt* at *W. Penn*'s *Logick*, but that he had a mind to *crack* of his own Skill therein. He ſays, *No Man ſays, The Body of Chriſt ſtrictly conſidered without the Soul of Chriſt, is Chriſt, or that either the Soul and Body of Chriſt ſtrictly conſidered, without the Godhead, is the Chriſt.* But let him tell me what they ſay, or upon their own Principle ought to ſay, Who affirm that *Chriſt*, as *Chriſt*, *was not in being, till he was born of the Virgin.* He ſays, *The Senſe of* W. Penn's *Argument is, That Chriſt's Body was no part of him.* Herein he doth *not* ſay the Truth; but gives a *wrong* ſenſe of *W. Penn*'s words. Though Chriſt was Chriſt, before he took upon him that Body, yet *after* he had aſſumed that Body, *it was a part of him*, though but the *Outward* part. He goes on to pervert *W. Penn*'s both ſenſe and words, ſaying as from *W. Penn. The one Seed cannot be an Outward thing*; and then ſays upon it, *This ye ſee is univerſal and excluſive of any outward thing.* W. Penn did not ſay, The one Seed *cannot be an Outward thing.* His words were, as a *Deduction* from his *Premiſes*, It will conſequently follow, that this Seed *muſt be Inward* and Spiritual; which doth not *univerſally* exclude it, from being in *ſome reſpect* an *Outward* thing alſo. But if *W. Penn* had ſaid, This Seed *cannot be an Outward thing*, intending thereby a thing *ſimply*, and *wholly* outward, ſo as to *exclude* its being *Spiritual* and *at all* Inward, Would *G. Keith* have conſented to that? I think not. It is evident *W. Penn* contended with ſuch as would *reſtrain* the Divine Seed of Promiſe to the *Body*, which Chriſt took of the *Virgin*, not being Spiritually-Minded

ed enough *to* apprehend any *other Seed*, than that which he then took of her; whereas the Promiſed Seed, which was the Heavenly Man, Chriſt Jeſus, was in being and did operate, in the Hearts of Men, and bruiſed the Serpent's Head there, *many Ages before* he took upon him, that Body of Fleſh of the Seed of the Virgin. And during that time, even from the making of that Promiſe, until the time of his outward coming at *Jeruſalem*, he was *altogether Spiritual*, working inwardly and Spiritually, againſt the Enemy in the Heart, and could not properly be called an *Outward thing*, at leaſt in the *groſs Notion* wherein we commonly uſe and underſtand the word *Outward*. Not that he was ſo *Inward*, as to be *no where*, *but in Man* (for he was in *Heaven* with his Father, *John.* 3. 13.) But when, in the fulneſs of time, he deſcended, and took on him the Seed of *Abraham* (by taking on him that Body of Fleſh from the Seed of the Virgin) he was *then*, and in *that* reſpect, *Outward* as well as *Inward*. Yet even then, and ſince, his Operation as a Seed of Light, Life and Power, to bruiſe the Head of the Serpent in Men, has been *Inwardly* and *Spiritually* felt in the Heart, working againſt, and ſubduing the Enemy *there*, where the Serpent is, and where he works moſt to the hurt and diſadvantage of Mankind. And therefore it was idly done of *G. Keith* to ask (in a Marginal note) *Is not the Serpent or Devil without Men, as well as within many Men?* Since his being *without* is *not ſo Deſtructive*, or dangerous *to Man*, as his being *within*: And therefore the Operation of the Holy Seed *within*, to bruiſe his Head, to break his Strength and Power there, and to caſt him out, is the *more* advantageous and neceſſary. And whereas *G. Keith* would infer from *W. Penn*'s ſaying, This Seed muſt be Inward and Spiritual, that he *univerſally excludes any Outward thing*, becauſe he adds, ſince one outward thing cannot be the *Proper* Figure and Repreſen-

tation

tation of another. He ſhould have conſidered, that though it cannot be ſo *properly*, yet it may be ſo *improperly*, or in a *leſs proper* way of Speaking; which is not unuſual in Scripture: And that therefore to ſay, one Outward thing cannot be the proper Figure, and Repreſentation of another, is not *univerſally excluſive* of any other thing.

His charging *W. Penn* with a Sorites (an imperfect or confuſed Argument) in ſaying, *Becauſe the Seed is one, and that Seed Chriſt, and Chriſt God over all, bleſſed for ever, We do conclude, and that moſt truly, that Chriſt was, and is the Divine Word of Light and Life, that was in the beginning with God, and was and is God over all, bleſſed for ever*; I ſay his quarrelling at this is *Idle*, and ſhews he did not underſtand the Matter. But the Inference he makes is *worſe*: For he ſays, *Thus you ſee, he makes the promiſed Seed to be nothing, but an Inward Principle, God over all*, &c. Why then, is God over all *nothing* but an Inward Principle, with G. *Keith*? But *W. Penn* did not ſo *confound* things: For though (with the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 3. 16.) he ſaid, *The one Seed is Chriſt*; And (with the ſame Apoſtle, *Rom.* 9. 5.) *Chriſt is over all, God bleſſed for ever*: Yet he did not ſay, that Chriſt was God over all, *as he was the Seed*, nor that the *Seed of God* in Men, *was God*. So that G. *Keith* in his heat and haſte, has overſtruck himſelf, and *loſt his Blow*. So alſo he *ſhoots* at *random*, when he ſays, But to ſay, *Chriſt is only God, and not Man without us, as* W. Penn's *way of arguing imports, is moſt falſe Doctrine*. For neither did *W. Penn ſay ſo*, nor doth his way of arguing *import* ſo. The *plain import* of all his arguments in that long Quotation given out of him (which G. *Keith* cavils at) is, that Chriſt, as Chriſt, was from the beginning, *before* he took that outward Body of Fleſh, in which he ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*; which is ſo far from a denyal of his being *Man* as well as *God*, that it is a fair acknowledgment

ledgment of it, inaſmuch as he would not have been *Chriſt*, if he had not been *Man*, as well as *God*. As therefore he was Chriſt from the beginning, ſo was he alſo both *God* and *Man*, and that not only *in* his People, but out *of*, or *without* them alſo. And if he was truly Man *then*, before he appeared in that outward Body, which was nailed to the Croſs, to be ſure he is not leſs truly *Man now*, ſince that outward Manhood became (as I may ſay) a Cloathing to that Divine and Heavenly Manhood, which he had before, and is *glorified* with it.

What he intimates of a pretended Contradiction between *W. Penn* and *J. Whitehead*, is very Idle in it ſelf, and wicked in him, and the worſe, for that he urged it formerly in his Book called *The true Copy*, &c. And I anſwered then, in mine called *Truth Defended*, p. 131. (which he takes no notice of;) as I did alſo anſwer in that Book, much of what he hath now urged concerning Chriſt and his being the promiſed Seed, from p. 113. to p. 123. Where alſo I gave ſeveral Quotations out of *G. Keith*'s Books, ſhewing moſt plainly, that he hath maintained the very ſame things he now condemns in others, and yet will not condemn in himſelf, as particularly in his Book called *The Way caſt up*, where, *Sect.* 8. p. 93. In anſwer to an Adverſary's Charge, that we deny Jeſus the Son of *Mary*, to be the alone true Chriſt. He firſt anſwers, 'This is a falſe Accuſation; 'We own no other Jeſus Chriſt, but him, that was born 'of the Virgin *Mary*, who, as concerning the Fleſh, is 'the Son of *Mary*, and the Son of *David*, and the Seed 'of *Abraham*. Then adds, p. 93. And yet *he was the* 'true Chriſt of God before he took Fleſh, and before he was 'the Son of *Mary*, or *David*, or of *Abraham*: For his 'being Born of the Virgin *Mary*, made him not to be 'Chriſt, *as if he had not been Chriſt before*; But he was 'Chriſt *before*, even from the beginning, as (ſays he) I

'shall prove out of Scripture, *&c.* And having brought divers Scriptures and Arguments, from p. 93. to p. 99. to prove that Christ Jesus, *as Man*, was from the beginning, and had from the beginning an *Heavenly Manhood*, and *Spiritual Flesh and Blood*; He there concludes thus, 'This is the **promised Seed**, which God promised 'to our Parents after the Fall, and **actually gave unto 'them**, even the **Seed of the Woman**, that should 'bruise the *Head* of the *Serpent*. And therefore, tho' 'the *outward* coming of the *Man* Christ was deferred, 'according to his *outward* Birth in the Flesh, for many 'Ages; yet from the beginning this **heavenly man**, 'the **promised Seed**, did *inwardly* come *into the Hearts* 'of those that believed in him, and bruised the Head 'of the Serpent, *&c.* Here *G. Keith*, not only asserts, that this *Heavenly Man* Christ, was the *promised Seed*, and did from the beginning *inwardly* come into the Hearts of Believers, and bruised the Head of the Serpent; but also calls him, *the Seed of the Woman*; and says, God not only promised him, but *actually gave him*, even *the Seed of the Woman* (that should bruise the Serpents Head) *unto our Parents after the Fall, many Ages before his outward Birth in the Flesh.* Surely, he that writ this, had no cause to quarrel with *W. Penn* for saying, Christ's Body, *strictly considered as such*, was not the Seed of Promise. *G. Keith* had more need to have reconciled himself to himself (if he could) in these two opposite Expressions of his, *viz.* [*That God gave the promised Seed, even the Seed of the Woman, actually to our Parents after the Fall, many Ages before his outward Birth in the Flesh*; Way cast up, p. 99.] And [That *Christ did not become the Seed of the Woman, according to the Sense of* Gen. 3. *Until the fulness of time, that he was made of a Woman*, True Copy of a Paper, p. 20.] And he should have done well, to have informed his Reader, *how* God did actually give unto our Parents after the Fall (so many

many Ages *before* Christ's outward Birth in the Flesh) the Seed he promised them, *Gen.* 3. Even the Seed of the Woman: And yet Christ, not be the Seed of the Woman, according to *Gen.* 3. until so many Ages *after* he was actually given, as the Seed of the Woman.

This is part of what I said to him in my former Book, called *Truth Defended*, p. 117, 118. which rather than Answer, he chose to *cut himself out new work at Turners-Hall*. He pretends he did not Answer my Books in Print, because he had not *time to write*, nor *outward Ability to Print*. I have shewed the Falshood of that pretence, in the fore part of this Book; yet let me now ask, If that had been true, why did he not then, at his Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, Answer my Books *viva voce*, which then lay at his door unanswered, and both *Refute* them, if he could, and acquit himself from those many *Clinching* Quotations I had therein *hampered* him with, out of his own Books, by explaining, defending, or *Retracting* them? This, I think, every considerate Person will judge had been more properly his *Province*, than wholly over-looking this, to spend his time in impeaching Others, by *Renewing* his old *Baffled* Charges, before he had cleared himself from being guilty of the same Errors (as he calls them) which he had charged others with. For if they whom he hath charged, were as bad as he endeavours to make them; yet he of all men is not fit to charge them, till he has acquitted himself from the *Imputation* he lies under of being guilty of the same things. This is so plain a Case, that it may be hoped upon his next *Indiction* of such a Mock Meeting at *Turners-Hall*, or elsewhere, some of his Auditors (when they are together) will think fit *to put him upon* this just and necessary Work, and, I had like to have said, *hold him to it*, but that I consider *he will be held to nothing*. However, to furnish any such a little further, with matter of that kind to *invite* him to, I will not think much

to transcribe another Quotation or two of his, which I gave him in my former Book, p.119,120.

The first is taken out of his *Appendix* to his Book of *Immediate Revelation*, p.256. where speaking of the *spiritual Generation* and *Birth* of Christ *in us*, he says, 'Thus 'we become the *Mother* of Christ in a *spiritual* sense, or 'according to the Spirit, as the Virgin *Mary* was his 'Mother after the Flesh. And this *Spiritual Mystery* 'Christ himself did teach in the days of his Flesh, 'when he said, *Whosoever shall do the Will of my Father* 'which is in Heaven, the same is my Brother, and Sister, and 'Mother, Mat. 12. 50. And thus (says *G. Keith*) Christ, 'according to *his spiritual Birth* in the Saints, is *the Seed* 'of the Woman; for that the *Saints* are the *Woman* 'that *bring him forth* after the Spirit, and are his Mo-'ther; as *Mary* brought him forth 'after the *Flesh*, and 'after the *Spirit* also; so that she was the Mother of 'Jesus in a double respect; for as she brought him forth 'in her *Body*, so she brought him forth in her *Soul*, other-'wise he could not have been her Saviour, &c. Here *G. Keith* calls *Christ* the *Seed of the Woman*, according to his *spiritual Birth in the Saints*; and yet quarrels with *W. Penn* for saying, The Seed Christ must be inward and spiritual.

Again, In *the Way cast up*, p.102. he says, 'For indeed, 'seeing he [Christ] is called *as really* Man, *before* his 'outward Birth in the Flesh, as *afterwards*, we have as 'good cause to believe him to be true and *real* Man, *be-'fore* his *outward* Birth in the Flesh, as *after*. For *it is not* 'the outward Flesh and Blood that is the Man, (otherwise the 'Saints that have put off the outward Body, should cease 'to be Men; and Christ should have ceased to be Man, 'betwixt his Death and his Resurrection) but it is 'the *Soul* or *inward Man* that dwelleth in the Outward 'Flesh or Body, *that is the Man* most properly, *such as* 'Christ was even from the beginning. And therefore (adds he,

he, p. 104.) 'Let all the Scriptures be ſearched, and it 'ſhall not be found that *Chriſt became Man*, and took to 'himſelf the *Soul of Man*, at his *Conception* in the Womb 'of the Virgin *Mary*; but **Only** that he *took Fleſh, and 'was the Son of Mary, David and Abraham, according to 'the Fleſh*: But according to his Heavenly Nature, even 'as *Man*, he was the *Son of God*, and was the Father and 'Lord of all the Faithful in all Ages, *&c.* Thus far out of my former Book. Beſides theſe, take the following out of his *Way to the City of God*, p. 125. 'And thus even from 'the beginning, yea, upon Mans Fall, God was in Chriſt, 'reconciling the World to himſelf, and Chriſt was manifeſt 'in the holy Seed *inwardly*, and ſo ſtood in the way to 'ward off the wrath, *&c.* For even at Man's Fall, the 'Seed of the Woman was given, not only to *bruiſe the Ser-'pents Head*, but alſo to be a *Lamb* or *Sacrifice*, to *attone 'and pacifie the wrath of God* towards Men. And **this is 'the Lamb**, that was *ſlain from the beginning of the 'World*. Again, p. 154. 'And in this holy Seed, the 'Sufferings of Chriſt, and how he bore the Iniquities of 'the Soul, and makes Interceſſion or Attonement unto 'God, may be learned in ſome meaſure, with many other 'things concerning Chriſt, in relation to him, and his 'Doings and Sufferings *in the outward*, which was an *out-'ward* and viſible *Teſtimony* of his *inward Doings and Suf-'ferings in all Ages*, in Men and Women in the *holy Seed*. 'And indeed we find that this is only the true and effe-'ctual way of knowing the Uſe and Work of his Com-'ing, and Sufferings, and Death, in the *outward*, by tur-'ning, and having our Minds turned *inwards*, unto him-'ſelf, *near* and *in our hearts*, in the *holy Seed*, to know by 'an *inward feeling* and good *experience* his *Doings and Suf-'ferings in us*, by being made *conformable* thereunto. In 'which *Holy Seed*, as it ariſeth in us, ſuch a clear Light 'ſhineth forth in our Hearts, as giveth unto us the true 'knowledge of the uſe of his *Inward Doings and Sufferings*.

In his *Additional Postscript* to *G. Whitehead*'s Book, called *The Nature of Christianity*, (which is one of the Books he cavils at in his Narrative, and which very *Postscript* he mentions there also, but does not *retract* any thing therein) he says, p. 66. to his Opponent *Gordon*, 'Because 'Christ is called the one Offering, and that he once offer-'ed up his Body, &c. Thou wouldst exclude him, as 'in us, from being one Offering, but *herein thy work is* 'vain; for Christ Jesus is the *one Offering still*; and tho' 'he offered up his Body outwardly but once upon the 'Cross, yet he *remains still an Offering for us within us*, &c. Again, p. 67. 'That thou challenge it, that one said, *Christ* 'was never seen with any Carnal Eye; thou hast no more 'ground than to challenge himself, who said; *He who* 'hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and yet he said to 'the Jews, who saw *the outward Body of Jesus*, You have 'neither seen him, nor known him. Thus *G. Keith*. And yet in his *Gross Error*, p. 14. he blames *G. Whitehead* for this Expression, and bringing *John* 14. to defend it. Again, says he, 'We deny not but the Names *Messiah*, 'Jesus, *Christ*, &c. were given to him as Man, even as 'in the Flesh; but they do more Eminently and more Originally belong to him, as he was before he *took that* 'Body on him; yea, more immediately and more ori-'ginally to the Word, the Light, the *Seed*, the Life, 'the quickning Spirit, that *dwelt in that Body*, which he 'called *This Temple*, and it was called *The Body of* 'Jesus.

To give more Instances out of his Books would be *tedious*, as to comment on these would be *needless*, they speak so plain the *same* things which he now calls *gross* and fundamental *Errors* in others. Wherefore leaving that to the Reader, as he now says he has done at present with his first Head, so have I also. In handling which, and Answering his many Cavils thereupon, I have been the larger, because I look upon this to be the greatest and

most

most important part of his Charge: For if Christ were denied, *both as God and Man*, not only the *Object* of Faith, but the whole Christian Religion would fall. But as I have proved his Charge *false* and *wrong* in this part, so I shall endeavour to shew it is in the other parts also; in which I will be more brief, if I can.

The Second Head of *G. Keith*'s Charge, (viz. *That we deny Justification and Sanctification by the Blood of Christ outwardly shed*) Considered.

The *Second Head* (says *G. Keith*) *is Justification and Sanctification by the Blood of Christ outwardly shed*; which he says, is opposed by *W. Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, and others. Now before I mention his pretended Proofs, I think fit to tell the Reader what this very Man has said of *W. Penn* concerning *Justification*, within these four years, viz. in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 10. he says, 'Nor are *W. Penn*'s 'words so to be understood concerning Justification, as 'if *he excluded Christs Righteousness*, which he fulfilled in 'his own Person; but only he denieth that any can be 'justified by that **alone**, without Faith and Repentance, *&c.* Did he write thus by rote, without reading what *W. Penn* had written? Or had he then read, and upon reading did then approve and justifie what *W. Penn* had writ of Justification; and yet now condemn it?

The Proof he now pretends to bring, *Nar.* p. 24, 25. is out of *W. Penn*'s Book called *Reason against Railing*, p. 91. *And forgive us our Debts as we forgive our Debtors.* Says *W. Penn*, 'Where nothing can be more obvious, 'than that which is *forgiven*, is *not paid*; and if it is our 'duty to forgive without a Satisfaction received, and 'that God is to forgive us as we forgive them, then is a 'Satisfaction totally excluded. (This also *G. Keith* objected in his *Gross Error*, p. 19.) Upon this *G. Keith* says

here, *I confess I was surprized with this word* totally excluded. *Satisfaction* (adds he) *is not the strict solution of a Debt in all respects and circumstances. When we consider the Dignity of our Lord, that was both God and Man; his Sufferings (suppose they were not the Thousand part of what the Damned suffer) yet is was a true satisfaction: Therefore I was scandalized with these words*, says he. But he needed not have been scandalized with those words, (unless he be altogether run back to the most *rigid* Presbyterians, in the strictest Notion of Satisfaction, *rejected by the Church of England*, whose *Hands* he seems most desirous now to *kiss*, perhaps that he may *lick some Advantage* therefrom) if he *would* have seen (what was so obvious, that he must *wink*, to avoid seeing it) that those words relate to, and are *expressly spoken* of that *rigid* or *extream* Satisfaction which those *Presbyterians* (and some *Baptists*) affirm God *required* and *exacted* of his Son. For thus *W. Penn* introduced those words which *G. Keith* cavils at, in *Reason against Railing*, p. 90. 'I shall now, said he, be as good 'as my word, and that is, to produce an Argument or 'two against the common Doctrines of **rigid** Satisfa-'ction and Justification, as they have been opposed by me 'in this short Discourse, and that out of my Book cal-'led *The Sandy Foundation shaken*, &c. Then out of that Book, he produced first an Argument drawn from *Mic.* 7, 18. p. 90. and in p. 91. from *Mat.* 6. 12. another Argument, in which are those words *G. Keith* takes offence at. *What sort of Satisfaction W. Penn* there opposed, appears from that Book called *The Sandy Foundation shaken*, out of which he transcribed those words. Now in the *Title Page* of that Book, that which is undertaken to be *Refuted*, on that Head of Satisfaction, is, *The impossibility of Gods pardoning Sinners, without a* **Plenary** *Satisfaction.* In the Epistle, p. 8. it is called God's *Incapacity* to *forgive*, without the **fullest** Satisfaction *paid* him by another. In the Book it self, p. 16. the Doctrine *oppugned*

pugned is, That Man having transgressed the Righteous Law of God, and so exposed to the Penalty of Eternal Wrath, *it is altogether impossible for God to remit* or forgive without a **Plenary** Satisfaction; and that *there was no other way* by which God could obtain Satisfaction, or save Men, than by inflicting the Penalty of **Infinite Wrath and Vengeance** on Jesus Christ, the Second Person of the Trinity, who for Sins past, present, and to come, hath wholly born and paid it to the offended infinite Justice of his Father. This shews plainly enough, *what a sort* of Satisfaction (or rather Notion of Satisfaction) *W. Penn* meant, which he said is *totally excluded*; namely, a *plenary* (or full) Satisfaction, by inflicting the penalty of *Infinite Wrath and Vengeance* on Jesus Christ, without which it is *altogether impossible* for God to forgive; and there was *no other way* by which God could obtain Satisfaction. Which *too rigid Notion* of Satisfaction *G. Keith* himself, whilst he stood in *The way to the City of God*, was as much against as *W. Penn*: For in his Book that bears that Title, p. 140. he saith, 'That he (Christ) 'did bear the wrath of God, either in that *manner* or 'measure which the *Damned* in Hell *do*, or *we should have* 'done, had not the Lord recovered us, *I altogether deny*; 'for he could and did satisfie the Father well and accept-'ably, without bearing it in *that way*.

But though the *Word Satisfaction* (with respect to Christ) be not a Scripture-term, nor was used by *W. Penn*'s Opponents, in a Scripture-sense: Yet that W. *Penn* did not deny the *Thing Satisfaction* (rightly understood) appears in the same Book wherein he treated of it, *Sandy Foundation shaken*, p. 32. where he says, 'I can boldly chal-'lenge any Person to give me one Scripture-phrase 'which does approach the Doctrine of Satisfaction, (much 'less the Name) *considering to what degree it is stretched*; not 'that we do deny, but *really confess*, that Jesus Christ, in 'Life, Doctrine and Death, fulfilled his Father's Will, and 'offered up a most satisfactory Sacrifice. But

But *G. Keith* himſelf, to his own Condemnation and Shame has juſtified *W. Penn* (yea and *G. Whitehead* too) in that for which he now condemns them. For in his Poſtſcript to the *Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 63. he tells *Gordon* (who had charged him with ſomething of this tendency) 'Both *G. Whitehead* and I expreſly affirmed, 'that Chriſt was a Sacrifice moſt acceptable and *ſatis-factory*; ſo ſaid *G. Whitehead*, yea and *W. Penn* in his 'Book, *ſaid as much*, whom *thou falſly haſt accuſed*) and 'a Ranſom, a Propitiation and Offering for the Sins of 'the whole World; but not that Men ſhould be juſtified 'while in their Sins, but in having forſaken them. *G. Keith* obſerves, that *W. Penn*, in the Book he Quoted, gives nine Arguments to prove *that the Notion of Chriſt's Satisfaction for Sin brings with it nine irrational Conſequences and Irreligious:* But he *ſays they are ſo weak and inſignificant, that it were but loſs of time to mention them here, or anſwer them.* From whence I obſerve, that thoſe Arguments were not againſt Chriſt's *Satisfaction*, but the *Notion* of it, that is, the *Notion* which his Opponents (both *Presbyterians* and ſome *Baptiſts*) had of it, which I have ſhew'd was, A *Plenary*, or *Full*, Satisfaction, by inflicting the Penalty of *infinite Wrath* and Vengeance on Jeſus Chriſt, without which, they held it was *altogether impoſſible* for God to remit or forgive; and the nine Arguments he mentions (how weak ſo ever he may repute them) are levelled, he knows *againſt that Notion*; which he himſelf ſeems not yet to be fully come up to: For he ſays, *Satisfaction is not the ſtrict Solution* (that is, Payment) *of a Debt in all reſpects and circumſtances*; yet *their Notion* makes it a *ſtrict ſolution*, and they ſay Chriſt hath *wholly Born and Paid* it. And *G. Whitehead* in his Book, called, *The Divinity of Chriſt*, &c. p. 45. (of the firſt Part) preſſing *T. Vincent* to prove by Scripture, that Chriſt did ſuffer under *infinite Wrath*, ſaith, 'He ſhould have produced his plain Scrip-

'ture;

'ture; for Scripture we own, and *Christ's Satisfaction* 'as rightly Stated, and what a moſt *acceptable Sacrifice* he 'was to the Father for all: Yea, his Suffering as Man, 'or in the Fleſh, without the Gates at *Jeruſalem*, was all 'acceptable to God; his Soul alſo was made an Offer-'ing for Sin, *&c.* Yet ſo unjuſt is *G. Keith* that though he knows it was that *falſe Notion* of Satisfaction which *W. Penn* oppoſed, yet he here Charges *G. VVhitehead* and *VV. Penn* (as alſo he did in his *Groſs Error*, p. 20.) with having *thruſt out of Doors by their falſe Logick, Chriſt's Satisfaction without us*; and then, that *they own that Chriſt in us offereth up himſelf a Sacrifice, to appeaſe the VVrath of God.* For which he cites, *VV. Penn's Rejoynder*, p. 284. and *G. VVhitehead's Light and Life*, p. 44. in both which Places, the Words he mentions are a Paſſage taken out of a Book, called, *a New Catechiſm*, written by *VV. Smith* Deceaſed, objected againſt by *Burnet* and *Faldo*, and explained and defended by *G. VVhitehead* and *VV. Penn*, But neither of them admits, that thoſe Words of *VV. Smith* have any tendency to make void the Sufferings or Sacrifice of Chriſt without. But it appears, that the Words were in Anſwer to a Queſtion, about Chriſts being a Mediator within, mediating with God, on behalf of any of his People, that commit evil, and ſo appeaſing the Wrath of God, by being a Propitiation for them, according to 1 *John* 2. 1, 2. This, one would have thought, might have gone down with *G. Keith*, it being ſo agreeable to his own Doctrine. For in his *VVay caſt up* (a Book not yet retracted) p. 157. he ſaid, 'And thus Chriſt doth declare 'himſelf to be the *Mediator* betwixt God and Man, *as* '*he is in them*, Thou in me and I in them; here Chriſt 'is the *Middle-man* or *Mediator*, as *being in the Saints*; 'Which Confutes the *groſs* and *moſt comfortleſs Doctrine* 'of the *Presbyterians* and others, who affirm that Chriſt 'as Mediator is *only without us*, in Heaven, and is not

'Me-

'Mediator in us, whereas he himſelf in this place hath 'declared the contrary. And leſt *G. Keith* ſhould a-gain Cavil at the Words [offereth up himſelf, *&c.*] I will remind him, that he himſelf (in his *Additional Poſtſcript* to *G. Whitehead*'s Book, called, *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 66.) anſwered his Opponent *Gordon* thus, 'Becauſe Chriſt is called the one Offering, and 'that he once offered up his Body, *&c.* Thou wouldſt 'exclude him, as in us, from being one Offering, but 'herein *thy Work is vain*; for *Chriſt Jeſus is the one Offer-'ing ſtill*; and though he offered up his Body outwardly 'but once upon the Croſs, yet *he remains ſtill an Offering 'for us, within us:* For he is a Prieſt for ever, and eve-'ry Prieſt hath ſomewhat to offer; and *he is both the Of-'fering* and the Prieſt, who liveth for ever to make *In-'terceſſion* for us. This is too good Doctrine ſtill in *G. K-th* to be retracted by him (for though he has mentio-ned this very Poſtſcript of his in his *Narrative*, yet *he has not retracted any thing in it*) though he can condemn the ſame in others; unjuſt Man as he is! Before I leave this place, let me put *G. Keith* in Mind (ſeeing he ſeem to have forgot it) of a neceſſary Caution he gave in his *Way to the City of God*, p. 127. thus, 'There-'fore we are not *too nicely to diſtinguiſh* betwixt the Influ-'ences of his inward and outward Coming and the Ef-'fects thereof, but rather to take them *conjunctly*, as in 'a perfect Conjunction, having a perfect Influence up-'on all Mankind, for their Reconciliation and Renova-'tion unto God, as obtaining that Meaſure of Light 'and Grace from God unto all and every one, whereby 'it is poſſible for them in a Day to be ſaved. And a-gain, p. 139. thus, 'But as I ſaid above, ſo I do again 'repeat it, that it may have the more weight, *viz.* that 'we are not *too nicely to make a difference* betwixt the In-'fluence and Effects of his *Outward* and *Inward* Suffer-'ings, but to underſtand them in a *perfect Conjunction*, '&c.

'&c. And ſo the People called Quakers do, ſay I.

Having had a fling at *W. Penn*, he ſays, *Let me come to* G. Whitehead *again.* And that he might ſtir up the People to *Lightneſs*, he tells them, *You ſhall have here a rare Diſh of Divinity*; and then to provide himſelf ſome *Defence* or *Excuſe*, after he had done it, he adds, *Not that I would provoke any to Lightneſs.* What *Hypocriſie* is this? Then to garniſh his *rare Diſh*, he ſays, *I have read many Books in my Time, but I never read ſuch a Book* (except *the Ranters*) *in my Life*; *Popery is Orthodoxy to it*; *no Popiſh Prieſt will argue as he has done.* (See how he *Banters* him, *Nar.* p. 22.) The Book he quotes is called, *The Light and Life of Chriſt within*, &c. p. 8. where he ſays *G. Whitehead* blames *W. Burnet* for ſaying, *The Blood ſhed upon the Croſs ſprinkles the Conſcience, Sanctifies, Juſtifies, Redeems us.* And in p. 18. of his *Groſs Error*, where he carps at the ſame Paſſage, and gives the Quotation more at large, but not truly) he ſays, *Note, Here it is plain that* G. Whitehead *doth altogether deny Juſtification by that outward Blood, or that it was the meritorious Cauſe of Salvation.* But this is a manifeſt *Falſhood*, and *Abuſe* put upon *G. W.* For he did neither deny the outward Blood to be the meritorious Cauſe of Salvation, Nor did he there undertake to diſcuſs, blame, or cenſure any of *Burnet*'s Doctrines or Aſſertions. That was to be done, and (with reſpect to ſome of them) was done, in the after part of the Book, to which that former Part was but as an *Introduction*; wherein *Burnet*'s *Contradictions* were collected and expoſed; and therefore immediately after thoſe Words of *Burnets*, p. 7. partly cited by *G. Keith*, viz. *The Blood ſhed upon the Croſs, the material Blood, meritorious to Salvation, ſprinkles the Conſciences, Sanctifies, Juſtifies, Redeems us*, &c. *G. Whitehead* added thus, But in Contradiction, p. 40. *That Blood ſhed is not in being* (ſays *Burnet*) *but he compares it to a price loſt.* Upon which

which *G. VVhitehead* made this Obſervation, p. 8. *Obſerve*, ſaid he, *here a twofold ſtreſs is laid upon that Blood. 1. Merit to Salvation*; 2. *VVork to Sanctification*; *and ſo he hath ſet it up above God: For God could not ſave, he ſaith, and yet it is not in being* (this *G. Keith*, in reciting *G. VVhitehead*'s Words, left out) *groſs Abſurdity! VVhereas Sanctification being a real VVork inward, that is certainly in being which Effects it.* This plainly ſhews, that that which *G. Whitehead* blamed his Opponent for was his *Self-contradiction*, in ſaying that Blood ſhed, Sprinkles, Sanctifies, Juſtifies, Redeems (which are all of the *preſent* Time) and yet withal ſaying, *that Blood ſhed is not in being.* This part *G. Keith* (as I noted) concealed; and then falls upon *G. Whitehead* (as he had done before, *Groſs Error*, p. 22.) for wronging *Burnet*, in charging him with having ſaid, *God could not ſave.* And he makes as if he would help *Burnet* out, but he quickly *pulls in his Horns*, ſaying, *Nay.* p. 25. *But I wholly wave that Diſpute; I think it is above Mans capacity, Whether antecedently to God's purpoſe, he could have ſaved us without the Death of his own dear Son.* Truly I doubted *nothing* had been *above* G. Keith's *Preſumption*, becauſe I have ſcarce ſeen him ſtick at any thing before, how much ſoever *above his Capacity.* But though he is willing to *wave* that Diſpute, yet to help off the *Baptiſt*, and fall in with other Oppoſers, he ſays, *But God having ſo ordained it, conſequentially to his purpoſe, it* (viz. That God could not ſave) *may be as ſafely and truly ſaid, as when the Scripture ſaith, God cannot lye. Is it any Reflection*, ſays he, *to ſay, God cannot lye, and that he cannot contradict his Purpoſe?* But I would know of him, whether to contradict (or to *alter*) *ones Purpoſe*, be the ſame thing, *as to Lye?* But it is probable *G. Keith* might borrow this Notion from *Jo. Owen*, who in his Book againſt the Quakers, called *A Declaration*, &c. has a touch of this kind, if I miſtake not, in p. 178.

G. Keith

G. Keith gives another Proof againſt *G. Whitehead*, out of the ſame Book, called, *Light and Life*, p. 38. and having ſet down the *Baptiſts* Words thus, 'Now 'the *Quakers* would be ſo far from directing Men to go 'to the material Temple at *Jeruſalem*, that they make 'it but a vain thing to look to *Jeruſalem*, to the An-'titype of that Temple, *viz.* to Jeſus Chriſt, as he was 'there Crucified, or to that Blood that was there ſhed 'for Juſtification; he ſays, now ſee the Anſwer, which he gives thus. 'The *Quakers* ſee no need of directing 'Men, to the Type for the Antitype, neither to the 'outward Temple, nor yet to *Jeruſalem*, either to Je-'ſus Chriſt, or his Blood, knowing that neither the 'Righteouſneſs of Faith, nor the Word of it, doth ſo 'direct, *Rom.* 10. And is it the *Baptiſts* Doctrine to 'direct Men to the material Temple, and *Jeruſalem*, 'the Type for the Antitype? What Nonſenſe and 'Darkneſs is this? And where do the Scriptures ſay, 'The Blood was there ſhed for Juſtification, and that 'Men muſt be directed to *Jeruſalem* to it? (Whereas that Blood ſhed is not in being, ſaid *G. Whitehead*, out of p. 40. of *Burnets* Book.) This Charge *G. Keith* exhibited *once before*, in his Book called, *The True Copy*, p. 19. (And in his *Groſs Error*, p. 1, 2.) And I have anſwered it already in mine, called, *Truth Defended*, p. 108, 109, 110. Where, amongſt other things, I ſhewed, that there is a *Typographical Error* in the Paſſage he carps at, and that whereas it is Printed thus, The *Quakers* ſee no need of directing Men to the Type for the Antitype, *viz.* neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to *Jeruſalem*, either *to* Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood; it ſhould have been, either *for* Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood. This *G. Keith* could not well ſhun noting (though he doth the reſt of my Anſwer) Therefore he ſays, *Nar.* p. 27. *T. Ellwood*, thinks to put a Trick on the Reader, and ſays it is wrong Printed, and that it ſhould

ſhould have been *for*, inſtead of *to*. (And in the Poſtſcript to his *Groſs Error*, calls it, a dull and ſilly Juggle.) But I not only ſaid it ſhould have been *for* inſtead of *to*, but proved it, and that I think very plainly. For I did not only ſay, I find it hath been ſo amended with a Pen in the Book which I have (which, as having the leaſt weight in it, *G. Keith* takes notice of, and ſays, I do not ſay *G. Whitehead* mended it; which is a very idle Cavil: For though I do not know, but *G. Whitehead* might mend it; yet if he did not, what then? Could it be expected he ſhould, with a Pen, mend a whole Impreſſion?) But that which I gave as a more demonſtrative Proof of the Place being miſprinted, *G. Keith* takes no notice of; which was this, *viz.* 'The 'former part of the Anſwer ſhews it ſhould have been 'ſo; for there it is, the Quakers ſee no need of direct-'ing Men to the Type *for* the Antitype (mark, *for* 'the Antitype, not *to* the Antitype:) And as it is ſo 'there (to the Type *for* the Antitype) ſo it muſt be 'here alſo, to the Temple, or to *Jeruſalem*, *for* Jeſus 'Chriſt, or his Blood. This plain Evidence *G. Keith* willingly ſhuns, and ſays nothing to it. But ſhuffles about, and ſays, *G. Whitehead* has it to, to, to, ſeveral Times, for which he quotes, p. 38, 39. and 61. That in p. 38. is the place in Controverſie. In p. 39. he uſes the Word *to*, as referring directly to *Burnet*'s Words, whoſe the Word *to* was, ſaying, 'Where do 'the Scriptures ſay, the Blood was there ſhed for Ju-'ſtification, and that Men muſt be directed to *Jeruſa-'lem* to it (to that Blood that was ſhed there, were *Burnets* expreſs Words, and therefore it was expedient *G. Whitehead*, repeating his Words, ſhould uſe it.) So likewiſe in that other inſtance, p. 61. where *G. Whitehead* ſetting forth the Confuſion and Self-contradiction of his Adverſary, keeps in expreſſing it, to his own Terms; and therefore ſays, 'Mark how one while

W. Bur-

'W. *Burnet* makes that Blood, and the ſhedding of it, 'his Juſtifier, Redeemer, *&c.* which he has confeſſed 'is not in being. Then (which *G. Keith* quotes) a-'nother while People muſt ſeek their Saviour above the 'Clouds and Firmament, contrary to the Righteouſneſs 'of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 6. Another while they muſt look to '*Jeruſalem* for Juſtification, *to* the Blood that was there 'ſhed. The Word *to*, was expreſly *Burnets* there; there-fore *G. Whitehead* kept to it. But in the very next Line, when he ſpake his own Words, he changed the Word *to* into *for*, ſaying, 'But if Men ſhould look to '*Jeruſalem for* that Blood, it is not there to be found, 'for it's not in being ſays *W. Burnet*. Now as this, and what I have ſaid before, manifeſts that it was a mi-ſtake in the Printing: So *G. Keith*'s contending to have it *wrong*, rather than *right*, againſt the Author's Senſe and Mind, rather than with it, ſhews him to be not only an *unfair* Adverſary, but a Man of an *evil* and *malicious* Mind: For none elſe would have repeated a Charge of Error againſt another, and perſiſted to urge it, as *G. Keith* hath done this, from a Word denied to be the Authors, and ſo apparently proved to be a Typographical Error only, as this was before. In his Controverſie formerly with *R. Gordon*, he blames him ſharply for ſerving him ſo, and tells him, '*Thou abuſeſt my* '*Words*, taking occaſion from a *ſmall Error in the* '*Printing*, which is a *diſingenuous way of dealing*; *and had* '*not thy prejudice blinded thee*, thou might'ſt eaſily have 'Corrected it by the Senſe. So might he this, had not his *prejudice* (not blinded him: For I ſuppoſe he ſaw it at firſt; however I ſhewed him it a Year ago, but) prevailed upon him to *wrong* G. Whitehead *knowingly*, which is *worſe* than if he had been blinded. Yet ſo earneſt is *G. Keith* in purſuit of his *falſe* Charge, that upon *G. Whitehead* ſaying *Burnet*'s directing Men to *Jeruſalem* for Chriſt is contrary to *Deut.* 30. 13, 14.

and *Rom.* 10. G. Keith cries out, *Is not this abominable Perverſion of Scripture, to confirm his Antichriſtian Doctrine?* But as *forward* as he was to Charge another, he was as *backward* to clear or defend himſelf. For in my former Anſwer to this Charge (*Truth Defended*, p. 110.) I ſhewed him that what he now calls in *G. Whitehead* an *abominable Perverſion of Scripture*, is not more than, if ſo much as, he himſelf had written (thirty Years ago) in his Book, called, *Help in time of Need*, (*not retracted by him*) p. 63. where he ſaith expreſly thus, 'And now we need not ſay, *Who will go down into* 'the Grave, and bring up Chriſt to us? or *who will aſ-* 'cend to Heaven, to bring him down to us? or who will 'go over the Seas, and *bring us Tidings of him from* Je- 'ruſalem where he ſuffered in the Fleſh? (Herein he had direct Relation to the Words of *Moſes* and *Paul* in *Deut.* 30. and *Rom.* 10.) 'Him, ſays he, (whoſe Name 'is the Word of God, *Rev.* 19.) we of a Truth wit- 'neſs nigh us, even in our Hearts; ſo that *we need not* 'either aſcend, or deſcend, or *go forth*, &c. Upon which I then told him there, p. 111. 'By this he may 'ſee how far he is *degenerated*, and *apoſtatized* from his 'former Principles: Then he was *not for aſcending*, *de-* 'ſcending, or *ſending to* Jeruſalem, to have Tydings of 'Chriſt brought *from thence*; becauſe he then witneſſed 'him, Chriſt, the Word of God, nigh him, even in 'his Heart: But now, being gone from the Word in 'his Heart, and turned againſt it, he is (it ſeems) for 'having Men directed *to* the Type, *for* the Antitype, 'to the outward Temple, or *to Jeruſalem*, *for* Jeſus 'Chriſt, and his Blood. Thus far in my former; of which he takes no more notice, than if he had *winked with both Eyes*, and never ſeen it.

His Cavil in p. 26. That *they* (the Quakers) *in their Preachments* (a Word he uſes in contempt and ſcorn, as other Prophane People do) *have uſed to ſtop at the eighth verſe*

verſe of Rom. 10. *and go no farther*; is both idle and falſe: For they have *not uſed to ſtop there*, but have *gone further*, and from *ver.* 9*th.* have opened and ſhewed what that *Mouth Confeſſion* and *Heart-belief* there ſpoken of, ſhould be, which is neceſſary and *effectual* to Salvation, which in the 10. *ver.* is called, a *Believing unto Righteouſneſs*, the ſame that in the 6*th ver.* is called, *The Righteouſneſs of Faith*, which directs, not to ſay who ſhall aſcend, or deſcend, to bring Chriſt down, or up; but directs to the Word that is *nigh thee*, in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart (which, ſays the Apoſtle, *Is the VWord of Faith which we preach*) *that if thou ſhalt confeſs with thy Mouth* (from this Word of Faith that is nigh thee, even in thy Mouth) *the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thine Heart* (from and by this Word of Faith that is nigh thee, even in thine Heart) *that God hath raiſed him from the Dead, thou ſhalt be Saved*; though thou go not to the Type (the material Temple) for the Antitype, nor look to *Jeruſalem* (the place where Chriſt ſuffered, whither the *Baptiſt* and *G. Keith* would ſend thee) to find him now there: For as it was ſaid by the Angel at the Sepulchre, after his Reſurrection, *Surrexit, non eſt hic*, He is riſen, He is not here, *Mark* 16. 6. much more may it be ſaid, ſince his Aſcenſion, (with reſpect to thoſe outward places where he was Crucified and Buried) *Aſcendit, non eſt hic*, He is aſcended, He is not here. Now as the Apoſtle, by *diſſwading* Believers from ſaying, who ſhall aſcend or deſcend, to bring Chriſt down or up, and directing them to him, as the Word nigh in the Mouth and Heart, did *not reject* nor *undervalue* the Death of Chriſt at *Jeruſalem*, or the Vertue of his Blood ſhed there: So neither did *G. Whitehead* in blaming the *Baptiſt* for directing People now to *go thither* or *look thither* for it, as if it were now to be found there. This, in effect, I told *G. Keith* before, in *Truth Defended*, p. 109. Where I ſaid, 'It was no

'Error in the Apostle *Paul* to direct (according to the 'Righteousness of Faith) to the Word nigh, in the 'Mouth, and in the Heart. Though he knew well e-'nough, that Christ had suffered at *Jerusalem*, and that 'but a little before; yet he did not direct Men to the 'outward Temple, or to *Jerusalem* (though both then 'standing) to find Christ, or his Blood there: For he 'knew, that Christ was not then to be found outward-'ly, either at the outward Temple, or at *Jerusalem*; 'but they that came to the Word nigh in the Mouth, 'and in the Heart, would both find Christ, and feel 'the Virtue of his Blood (*even of that Blood which he 'offered upon the Cross*) nearer home. So neither is it any 'Error in *G. Whitehead* to say, The Quakers see no 'need to direct Men to the Type for the Antitype, 'viz. neither to the outward Temple, nor to *Jerusa-'lem*, either for Jesus Christ, or his Blood: Nor in so 'saying doth he *deny*, or *disesteem* Jesus Christ, or his 'Blood (for he directs, with the Apostle, where Men 'may both find Jesus Christ, and may feel the Virtue 'of his Blood;) but he rejects the *Notion* of his Oppo-'nent, who (it seems) would have Men directed to 'the Type for the Antitype. *G. Whitehead* therefore has not *falsified* the Scriptures, and made them to say what they say not, as *G. Keith falsly Charges him.* But *G. Keith* hath *falsly accused* G. Whitehead, and *grossly perverted* both his Meaning and his Words, and that not only here, but in his *Gross Error*, p. 15. also.

The next thing he offers is *Solomon Eccles*'s Letter, a Copy of which he gives in p. 28. But before he read it, he said, p. 27. *Next, you shall hear* Solomon Eccles's *Letter, That the Blood of Christ is no more than the Blood of another Saint.* This he did to *prepossess* his Auditors with an *ill Opinion* of it, before they heard it; and he also wrong'd *S. Eccles* in those Words: For he delivers it as *S. Eccles*'s, 'That the Blood of Christ, (*indefi-*

definitely, and *without any Distinction*) is no more than the Blood of another Saint. Whereas it is evident by the Letter it self (as he has given it) that *S. Eccles* did *distinguish* between the Blood of Christ, which was *offered up in the Eternal Spirit*, Heb. 9. 14. and the Blood that was *forced out of him by the Souldier, after he was Dead*. The Blood that was offered up by Christ himself in the Eternal Spirit, *Heb.* 9. 14. he declares *he did very highly esteem of*, even to be more Excellent, and Living, and Holy, and Precious, than is able to be uttered by the Tongues of Men and Angels. But that Blood which he said was no more than the Blood of an other Saint, was the Blood that was *forced out of him by the Souldier after he was Dead*. So that, that upon which *S. Eccles* did ground the difference he put between the Blood of Christ in one respect, and in another, was, that in the one, it was *a voluntary offering of Christ himself*, in and by the Eternal Spirit, *before his Death*: In the other, it was the *forcible Act of a Souldier, after he was Dead*, and the Sacrifice compleated. This *G. Keith* (had he been fair, even as an Adversary) should have observed to his Auditors, how much so ever he had disliked *S. Eccles*'s Expression; which I know no Quaker did ever *approve*, much less undertook to *Justifie*, or *Defend*; I am sure I did not, nor *G. Whitehead* neither, in his Answer to *Burnet*, out of which *G. Keith* Charges him with it: For he therein (as I noted in my former) both *disclaimed those Words*, by saying, *I do not make* S. Eccles's *Expressions therein an Article of our Faith:* and also for himself declared, that *he did own the Blood shed to be more than the Blood of another* Saint, Light and Life, p. 59. And I called those Words of *S. Eccles*'s *an unjustifiable Expression*, Truth Defended, p. 112. Therefore *G. Keith* is *unjust* in reflecting upon us as he does in p. 30. for though he gave the Copy of the Letter in p. 28. yet

(for what Reaſon, I know not, whether to *perplex the Cauſe*, or that he himſelf was in *Confuſion* and *Diſorder* when he delivered it) he interweaves another Matter, which takes up wholly his 29th Page, and then in p. 30. returns to the Letter, ſaying, *Now as to the Letter, we go on*, &c. But for what end ſoever he made that *Irregular Tranſition* from one thing to another, though I might juſtly ſtep over what he has interpoſed, and follow the *Thread* of his *Diſcourſe* upon the *Letter*; yet that it may appear how willing I am to anſwer *all* his Cavils, I will ſuſpend what is further to be ſaid to his Exceptions about the Letter, and go back with him to p. 29.

There he ſets down *Burnet*'s Words, and as a Sign he did not well know what he did, he ſets them down *twice over*. They were theſe, 'All things under the 'Law, in the Type, was purged with Blood, and this 'Blood was *material* Blood, and *not Myſtical*; and that 'Blood that Chriſt ſhed, in order to the effecting the 'Salvation of Man, muſt need be Viſible and Material 'Blood. To this *G. Whitehead*'s Anſwer, was, 'Do 'but mark here what a ſad Conſequence he has drawn; 'as if one ſhould Reaſon, that becauſe the Type was 'Material, Viſible, and *not Myſtical*; therefore the An-'titype or Subſtance muſt needs be Material, and *not* 'Myſtical. By this *all Myſteries*, or Divine Things, 'are excluded from being either Spiritual, Antitype, 'or Subſtance; whereas it was the heavenly things 'themſelves that are in Chriſt, in which conſiſts the 'Subſtance and End of Types and Shadows. But to 'ſay, that material Blood was a Type of that which 'was material; this is to give the Subſtance *no preheminence* above the Type (eſpecially if neither of them 'be *Myſtical*, nor in being (which was the *Baptiſt*'s Opinion) or like as if one ſhould ſay, one Type was 'a Type of another; there *G. Keith* makes a full ſtop, leaving out about half a ſcore Lines of *G. Whitehead*'s An-

Anſwer, without diſcovering that he did do ſo. I will put them in between two Crochets, that the Reader may obſerve which they were, thus, ['As to ſay, becauſe 'Circumciſion, which was a *Type*, was material or out-'ward, therefore the *Circumciſion* of the Spirit, which 'is the *Antitype* of it, muſt needs be outward too, and 'not *Myſtical* (which would be ſad Doctrine:) And 'thus he might as well Reaſon, touching *all other Types* 'and Shadows under the Law, and the heavenly or 'good things to come, prefigured or ſhadowed by 'them. That becauſe the *Prieſts* under the Law (at 'the outward Tabernacle and Temple) were Miniſters 'of outward, or temporal Things, carnal Ordinances, 'Shadows, *&c.* Therefore thoſe good things to come, 'thoſe heavenly things, which Chriſt was ſaid to be the '*High-Prieſt* of, muſt needs be Temporal, and not *My-'ſtical*; which were abſur'd to aſſert;] Whereas both 'the heavenly and more perfect Tabernacle and Altar, 'with the heavenly Things, are all a *Myſtery*, and *Spi-'ritual*; the Offering and Living Sacrifices are Spiritu-'al; the Paſſover Spiritual, the Seed Spiritual; the 'Bread, the Fruit of the Vine, the Oyl, the Fleſh and the 'Blood, (which give Life to the Soul) yea, the Water and 'Blood (which waſheth and ſprinkleth the Conſcience) 'are all Spiritual and Myſterious, as the New Cove-'nant it ſelf is, which they belong to, and theſe things 'known in; and this is the new and living Way which 'Chriſt ſet open, through the Vail of his Fleſh, *Heb.* 10. 'Let them receive this who can, p. 59, 60. I would not have tranſcribed this whole Anſwer, (eſpecially having given it at full length before in my former Book) but that I obſerved *G. Keith* had ſlily dropt a conſiderable part of it, and I thought he might probably take advantage againſt me, if I ſhould have omitted any of the reſt. From the whole it appears, that *G. Whitehead* did not ſo much apply himſelf in his Anſwer to overthrow his

Opponent's Argument in that one Particular, as to ſhew the general abſurdity and miſchief of the Conſequence of that Argument, which reached alike from the other Types in the Old Covenant, to the other Antitypes in the New Covenant. This *G. Keith* obſerved, and to help the *Baptiſt* off, he ſays, *VV. Burnet does not expreſs it univerſally, but in this particular Caſe: And* G. Whitehead *extends it to an univerſal.* He ſays right in the *firſt* part, *VV. Burnet* does not expreſs it *univerſally*; but the Conſequence of his Argument has ſuch an *univerſal extent*: Which *G. VVhitehead* obſerving, attackt him there; not as *G. Keith* repreſents it (who has *the Art of Sophiſticating*) as if all the Types of the Old Teſtament ſignified nothing internally and ſpiritually, (upon which he ſays, *But* W. Burnet *ſaid no ſuch thing*) But as if all the Antitypes in the New Teſtament muſt be altogether as external and *void of Spiritual Myſtery*, as their reſpective Types in the Old Teſtament were; which the Conſequence of *VV. Burnet*'s Argument ſays.

G. Keith Notes that, by *G. VVhitehead*'s Argument, as the New Covenant is ſpiritual and inward, *and not outward*, ſo the Blood of the New Covenant is Inward, and *not outward*, ſo the Paſſover is inward, which is Chriſt the Mediator, and *not outward*. Now take notice, that the Words [and *not outward*] in all theſe *three* places, are *not* G. Whitehead's, nor to be found in his Anſwer, but are *added by G. Keith of his own Head.* And from this Addition of his, he makes this Inference, *This is a plain denyal of the Man Chriſt without us, to be our Mediator, our Paſſover, Offering, or his Fleſh and Blood without us to be concerned in our Salvation, otherwiſe than as the Type.* Now I do not think this proceeds either from his *Ignorance*, or *Overſight*; but from his *Injuſtice* and *Malice*. For he knows, that when we ſpeak of Chriſt, we do not *put aſunder what God hath joyned*

joyned together, but we take his *Divinity* and *Manhood* conjointly and *united*, always acknowledging him to be *without us*, as well as *within us*. And as little *Juſtice* as *G. Keith* ſhews to us, I have ſo much *Charity* for *G. Keith*, as to think, that when, in his *VVay caſt up*, p. 157. he ſaid, 'Thus Chriſt doth declare himſelf to be 'the *Mediator* betwixt God and Man, **as he is in 'them**; he did not intend a *plain denyal* of the Man Chriſt *without* to be our Mediator. But he knows (if *he would*, or by this Time *could*, *be Juſt*) that the great Reaſon of our ſo much aſſerting Chriſt's Inward Appearance and ſpiritual Manifeſtation as a Mediator, Sanctifier, Juſtifier and Saviour within, has been (as to aſſert the Truth, ſo) to counterpoiſe (if I may ſo ſpeak) the contrary Doctrine and Aſſertion of thoſe who deny him to be, with reſpect to theſe Offices, *at all within*, and *ſhut him wholly out*, making the Work of Mediation, Sanctification, Juſtification and Salvation, to be *only* and *altogether outward*; whereas we acknowledge *to the utmoſt* whatever Chriſt hath done, or doth, without us, in order to our Salvation; yet cannot exclude the inward Work. And I am perſwaded, this Conſideration which I have now mentioned, had ſome impreſſion on *G. Keith*'s Mind, when he writ thoſe Words I laſt cited of his, out of his *VVay caſt up*, p. 157. which made him (after he had repeated, from thoſe Words of Chriſt, *Thou in me, and I in them*, here Chriſt is the Middle-man, or Mediator, as being in the Saints) add theſe Words, *viz.* 'Which confutes 'the groſs and moſt comfortleſs Doctrine of the *Preſ-'byterians* and others, who affirm that Chriſt, as Medi-'ator, **is only without us**, in Heaven, and **is not 'Mediator in us**, whereas he himſelf in this Place hath 'declared the contrary.

Let us go on to his *Clinch*: For he ſays, *Now here I clinch the Matter*; and he attempts it thus. *G. VVhite-*

head

head (says he) says, *But to say material Blood was a Type of that which was material, this is to give the Substance no preheminence above the Type* (*especially, if neither of them be Mystical, nor in being*) *or as if one should say, one Type was a Type of another*, (so also, *Gross Error*, p. 18.) Well, this explains it self, by those Words in the Parenthesis, (*especially, if neither of them be Mystical*;) For those Words shew that he no otherwise opposes the Antitype's being *Material*, than his Adversaries Argument excludes it from being *Mystical*, or *Spiritual*. This also appears to be his Sence, from the very Entrance of his Answer, where he said, 'Do 'but mark here what a sad Consequence he has drawn; 'as if one should Reason, that because the Type was 'Material, Visible, and *not Mystical* (which was *Bur-'net's* Term) therefore the Antitype, or Substance, 'must needs be Material, and *not Mystical*: By this all 'Mysteries or Divine things are excluded from being 'either Spiritual, Antitype, or Substance: And from hence it was that *G. Whitehead* said, '*This is to give 'the Substance no preheminence above the Type*, when the Substance or Antitype is *denied to be Mystical*, and made *only Material*, because the Type thereof was only Material, and *not Mystical*. As to the other part of *G. Whitehead's* Words, which *G. Keith* takes into his *Clinch*, viz. ['*Or like as if one should say, one Type was 'a Type of another*:] It appears from the Place in *G. Whitehead's* Book, that he spake it of those *Temporal* and *Carnal Ordinances*, which he there mentions, and particularly of *Circumcision*, which in the very next Words he joyns to those former, thus, 'As to say, *be-'cause Circumcision*, which was a *Type*, was *material* or 'outward, therefore the *Circumcision* of the Spirit, which 'is the *Antitype* of it, must needs be *outward* too, and 'not *Mystical*. Wherein perhaps he might give a *close Nip* to those who hold *Circumcision* to have been a *Type* of

of *Water Baptism*, and *Water Baptism* to be a *Type* of the *Spiritual Baptism*; thereby making *one Type a Type of another*.

But I find *G. Keith* cannot *clinch* his Matter, until he has *made an Argument* for *G. Whitehead*, therefore he says, *Now the Argument lies here, If the Sacrifices under the Law were Types of Christ's Blood, then that Blood must not be outward Blood, but inward.* Nay, nay; *G. Whitehead* said not so. He did not say *it must not be outward*, but it must not be *only outward*: It must not be *so outward*, as to *destroy its being Inward*. It is *both Inward* and *outward*, and hath *always* been so believed and owned by the *Quakers* in general, and *G. Whitehead* in particular. Whereas therefore *G. Keith* says, *This is a false Consequence of* G. Whitehead, *and sheweth that he denies Remission of Sin, and Justification by the Blood of Christ outwardly shed*; I say, That *false Consequence is* G. Keith's, and shews that he hath *renounced honesty and shame*. For *G. Whitehead* doth *not deny*, but *owns* Remission of Sin, and Justification so far, by the Blood of Christ *outwardly shed*; but not that Justification (in the *right sense* of the Word, as it imports a being *made Just* or Righteous) is wrought *only* by the shedding of the Blood outwardly, without feeling the living Vertue of the Blood *inwardly*, *purging the Conscience* from dead Works, to serve the living God. Thus *G. Keith*'s Matter is left *unclinched*. Now let us return to what he says upon *S. Eccles*'s Letter, in p. 30. where he begins thus:

Now as to the Letter, says he, *we go on to what* T. Ellwood *says. He* (says *G. Keith*) *is so unfair, he will have it, that* G. Whitehead *owns, that the material Blood of Christ is that by which we are justified.* Of that I have newly spoken, and shewed how far, and in what Sence, that is, and ought to be owned. But alas! Does he call me *unfair* for this? I rather thought he would have called,

called, at leaſt have accounted, me *fair* in that. Would he therefore rather have *G. Whitehead* not own, than own it, only that he might have a *ſpiteful blow* at him? *What an evil Mind is that*! Yet in that *evil Mind*, he goes on thus; *But here*, ſays he, *is the Trick*, G. Whitehead *makes a Typical Offering of Chriſt, and an Antitypical; the Typical was the Offering of Chriſt at* Jeruſalem, *the Antitypical is the Offering of Chriſt within.* This is a *Trick* indeed, an *horrible falſe Trick* of *G. Keith*'s *own deviſing.* So again, a little below, he ſays, *If Chriſt's Blood outwardly ſhed was a Type, as* G. Whitehead *affirms it was.* (Where does *G. Whitehead* affirm ſo? I affirm I never ſaw that Affirmation yet; but ſince he affirms that *G. Whitehead* has ſo affirmed, I put him to produce that Affirmation.) *See here then*, ſays he, *their Anſwer; It was queried, whether they owned that we are by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, juſtified: Or that the Blood that was outwardly ſhed, did belong to the Sacrifice?* G. Whitehead *has ſince of late anſwered*, Yea: *Here*, ſays he, *they have ſought to blind all the World*; *Chriſt*, adds he, *as he outwardly ſuffered, was a Sacrifice, but a Typical Sacrifice. Therefore*, ſays he, *the next Queſtion to be put, muſt be, Whether he was the Antitypical Sacrifice?* Ay, ſo let it: And the Anſwer to it ſhall be, *Yea, He was the Antitypical Sacrifice*, of which the legal Sacrifices were a *Type*; but that he was ever called a *Typical Sacrifice*, I never heard nor ſaw from any *Quaker*'s Mouth or Pen. Such *foul Falſhoods, and groſs Slanders* as theſe, neither deſerve nor need any other *Refutation* than a bare *denyal.*

He is highly offended with *G. Whitehead*, about *S. Eccles*'s Letter: He would have had him blamed, and cenſured it *ſeverely* and *ſharply*, as *blaſphemous.* If *G. Whitehead* had been as *hot-headed* as *G. Keith*, perhaps he might: But *Blaſphemy* is an high Charge, and they that underſtand it aright, are not ſo forward as *G. Keith* (it ſeems) would

would be, to *brand Persons* with it, for every *unsound Expression*. *G. Keith* is *too hot* and *hasty* to see aright. He can find *nothing at all* in *G. Whitehead*'s Answer to *blame* or *censure* the Letter: Yet in p. 31. his Narrative tells us, A Quaker did observe to him, That *G. Whitehead* did *find fault with the Letter*: *G. Whitehead*'s saying, He did not make *S. Eccles*'s Expression an Article of our Faith, (which is as much as to say, *I don't believe what he says in that matter*, or am *one with him in it*) is not a disowning, with *G. Keith*. But if he reasons well, when he says, p. 31. *He that doth not testifie against a thing, when he has just occasion for it, justifies it*: May I not, with as good reason, say, *He that doth not justifie a thing, when he is put upon it, disowns it*. There is an *implicit*, as well as an *explicit* owning or disowning of a thing. But *G. Keith* is *in* and *out*. In one place he says, He can find *nothing of blame or censure at all*: A few lines lower he says, *But I find not that he censured it all*. It did not *all* deserve *censure*. Next (says *G. Keith*) *G. W.* tells you in what sence he owns it, (understands by it not the *Letter*, but the *Blood* shed) viz. *That Blood had a peculiar signification*; *I told him* (says *G. Keith*) *so had the Blood of Beasts a peculiar signification, for their Blood signified Remission of Sin, but was no Satisfactory Offering for sin.* But the signification which that Blood had, did *peculiarly excel* that of the Blood of Beasts: For the Blood shed was a *satisfactory offering for sin*, and did obtain Remission of Sin for all those that *truly* believe in, and *faithfully* follow the Lord Jesus Christ. But G. *Keith* did not fairly by G. *Whitehead*, in saying, He tells you in what sense he owns it, *viz.* That Blood had a peculiar signification; and stops there, as if that were all G. *Whitehead* had said. For G. *Whitehead* went on, and shewed wherein he owned that Blood shed to be more than that of another Saint, in many particulars of great weight.

He confesses that I say, G. *Whitehead* does own, That the Blood of Christ is more than the Blood of another Saint;

Saint; *But what Blood*, ſays G. *Keith*? *The Blood of Chriſt within*, ſays he, and then ſays, *There's the Trick.* He is *full of his Tricks*; and it were well that he had not *more Tricks than are good*: But *ſuch Tricks as theſe* he never learnt among the *Quakers*. Neither will his *putting theſe Tricks upon us*, hurt us, ſo much as himſelf: For the Juſt God, who knows our *Innocency*, and his *Envy*, will clear us, and give him, unleſs he unfeignedly Repent, the *Reward due to him for his wicked and unjuſt Accuſations.* In the mean time, he himſelf ſhall Convict himſelf of *Falſhood* in this *foul* Charge. Here he makes me to mean by the Blood of Chriſt, which G. *Whitehead* ſaid he owns is more than the Blood of another Saint, the Blood of Chriſt *within.* Yet in the ſame page, (p. 30.) had ſaid before, He (*T. Ellwood*) is ſo unfair, he will have it, that G. *Whitehead* owns that the *material* Blood of Chriſt is that by which we are juſtified. How hangs this together, That I would have the Blood which G. *Whitehead* then treated of, and owned, to be the *Material* Blood of Chriſt: And yet at the ſame time I would have the ſame Blood to be (*not the Material Blood*, but) the Blood of Chriſt *within*? Beſides, G. *Whitehead* ſpake of that Blood mentioned in the Letter, which S. *Eccles* ſaid was *forced out by the Soldier*, and expreſly ſaid, he owned the Blood ſhed was more than the Blood of another Saint. And will G. *Keith* call that the Blood of Chriſt *within*? Do theſe things ſquare? Does not this manifeſt the *Trick* to be G. *Keith*'s? Yet upon this *Trick of his*, he cries out, *Is not this enough to Cheat all the World?* Have not I more cauſe to ſay, Are not *ſuch falſe Trick as theſe* enough to *belie*, *abuſe*, *defame*, *ſlander* all the World? What Man can be ſecure from ſuch a *Tricker* as G. *Keith* is! He goes on with his *Trick* further, *They have*, ſays he, *a double meaning, as* Arius *had. They ſay they own the Blood of Chriſt, and every other thing ſaid of him according to the Scrip-*

Scripture; *ſo*, (adds he) *ſaid the* Arians *and* Macedonians, *when at other times they diſcovered their meaning to be quite contrary to Scripture.* Is not this Man paſt ſhame? He ſays we have *a double meaning*, as *Arius* had. He muſt ſay this either from *Suppoſition*, or *Knowledge*. If from *Suppoſition*, what can be more *horribly wicked*, than to *brand* a People, or Perſons with ſo great a *Blemiſh*, upon *Suppoſition* only? If he will pretend to *know*, that we have a *double* meaning, he muſt pretend to have that *Knowledge* either from our *Books*, or our *Mouths*. From our Books he can know it no more than another Man, they being publick and common to all; neither has he proved, nor can he prove it from our Books. If he will pretend to have had it from any of our *Mouths*, let him name the Perſon; *I provoke him to it.* He ſays in his *Solemn Appeal*, p. 7. 'He thinks he ſhould know, 'and doth know, theſe called *Quakers*, and their Prin-'ciples, far better than *Cotton Mather* (his then Oppo-'nent) or any, or all his Brethren, having been *con-'verſant* with them in *publick Meetings*, as well as in *pri-'vate Diſcourſes*, with the *moſt noted* and eſteemed a-'mong them, for about 28 Years paſt, and that in many 'places of the World, both in *Europe* and *America*. Now if we had a *double meaning*, as he ſays we have, ſo as to *ſay one* thing, and *mean another*; he who has had (as he pretends) ſo *cloſe* and *intimate* a Converſation with us, for ſo many Years, muſt needs in that time have *obſerved* it, diſcovered it, known it, been privy to it, and conſequently be able to make a *plain, demonſtrative, evidential Diſcovery* and Proof thereof; which *I again provoke him to.* Had he that *Trick* when he was among us? He complains, (in his Book called, *The Chriſtian Faith*, &c. printed but in 1692. p. 3.) of *Chriſtian Lodowick* (ſuch another *Apoſtate* as himſelf) that 'Whereas divers of us (ſays he) declared ſincere-'ly before many People their ſincere Faith, as concern-

'ing

'ing the *Lord Jesus Christ of Nazareth*, and what the 'holy Scriptures testifie of him, yet he did continue to 'accuse them still, as *denying the true Christ*, alledging, '*They had another sense than the Scripture-words did bear: 'Appealing to their Consciences, whether it was not so*: Thus 'making himself Judge (says G. *Keith*,) over our secret 'thoughts, as having a secret Sense in our thoughts of 'Scripture words, contrary to the true Sense of them, 'though we have not given him, or any other, occasion 'to judge so rashly and uncharitably of us; and our 'Consciences bear us witness, in the sight of God, that 'we do sincerely believe and think as we speak: Thus *G. Keith* but four years ago, even after he had begun his quarrelling in *Pensilvania*; yet the very same thing he then blamed *C. Lodowick* for doing towards him, he now does himself towards us: Would one not think he had learnt this *Trickling Art* from that Apostate (as he represents him) *C. L*? He compares us to the *Arrians* and *Macedonians*, some of the *worst* of Hereticks, and in that for which they were *more to be condemned*, than for their Heresies, since these might possibly proceed from *Ignorance* and *Mistake*, that must flow from *Hypocrisy* and *Design. I reject his comparison*, and in plain and sober words, *deny his Charge*, as a most *abominable Falsehood* and Slander.

In p. 31. he quarrels with *G. Whitehead* for saying, *S. Eccles's intent in those words*, No more than the Blood of another Saint, *was as to Papists, and you, whose minds are Carnal, who oppose the Light within; and also simply as to the Essence of the Blood, which you dare not say is still in being.* To the first part of this Sentence he says, *This never was my Quakerism. For my belief all along, was*, that *Papists*, and *Baptists*, and *all, have a benefit by Christ's Death.* And so was *G. Whitehead*'s too. Because his Death being a *general Attonement* for all that shall believe in, and receive him, *all* are thereby put into a *Capacity*, by receiving

receiving and believing in him, to attain unto Salvation. But if any, whether Papiſts, Baptiſts, or other, being *carnally minded* (which *is*, or brings *Death*, Rom. 8. 6.) do in their *carnal* mind, *Oppoſe* the Light within, and *continue ſo to do*, of what particular benefit, to the Salvation of the Soul, will the Blood of Chriſt be to them? Therefore *G. Keith* in this, as in almoſt all places, deals *unfairly* with *G. Whitehead*, neither taking his *right* ſenſe, nor giving his *full* words: For what *G. Wqitehead* delivered (as *S. E*'s intent) with reſpect to *ſuch* Papiſts and Baptiſts whoſe minds are *carnal*, and who *Oppoſe* the Light within; that *G. Keith* extends to Papiſts and Baptiſts *Univerſally*, and draws his Concluſion accordingly thus, *Now it is come to this*, ſays he, *That the Blood of Chriſt is no more to Papiſts and Baptiſts, than the Blood of another Saint.* As if *all* Papiſts and Baptiſts, *quâ tales*, muſt of neceſſity be *carnally minded*, and *oppoſe* the Light within. In like manner he deals with him, in the latter part of that Sentence, *viz. And alſo ſimply as to the eſſence of the Blood, which you dare not ſay is ſtill in being*, &c. Which plainly appears to have been Spoken, *ad hominem* only, upon the Baptiſts *Notion*, that that Blood which was ſhed, *was not in being.* Yet upon this *G. Keith* deſcants, alledging what no Quaker, that I know of, ever denied, *viz. That it was never defiled with Sin, and had a Miraculous Conception*; but wholly conceals thoſe other words of *G. Whitehead*'s, which in his Book immediately follow, [*But not as to the Spiritual Virtue and Teſtimony, which is ſtill in being.*] Which (ſaid *G. Whitehead*) *S. E. owned to be his Intention.* And that plainly proves, that *S. E.* owned the Blood ſhed, was more than the Blood of another Saint, as to the Spiritual Virtue and Teſtimony of it.

But ſays *G. Keith*, *Let us conſider theſe words of* S. E. *which* G. Whitehead *ſaith, might ſatisfy any Spiritual or unbyaſſed man*, viz. *I do very highly eſteem of the Blood of*

Christ to be more excellent, &c. There *G. Keith* stops with an, *&c.* which he should not have done: For if he had a mind to save the Transcribing those other good Epithets (*Living*, *Holy*, *Precious*,) which *S. E.* added to the *Blood*, yet he should not have overppassed those *explanatory* Words of *S. E*'s which follow, *viz. I mean the Blood which was offered up in the Eternal Spirit*, Heb. 9. 14. The words of that Scripture are, *How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit, offered himself without Spot* (or fault) *to God, purge your Consciences?* &c. Hence it is evident, that by the *Blood* of Christ, which S. *E.* said, he so *highly esteemed*, he meant the Blood that was *of* and *in* that Body, which was *offered up upon the Cross*: For he refers expressly to this Scripture, which Speaks directly of that Offering. This G. *Keith unfairly* (but like himself) concealed; and then cries out, *Here's* S. E's *Fallacy*, *and* G. Whitehead's *Fallacy also*. But I think he will not be able to make it out, without the help of one of his former *Tricks*; nor even with it. Thus he goes on, *Now you know what Blood they mean, and see what Blood* G. Whitehead *means. The Blood is Spiritual and Inward, the other is a Type.* If they know what we mean, it is a sign *we mean as we speak and write*; for they could not know our *meaning*, but by our *speaking* or *writing*. But such as mean to know our meaning aright, will do well to take it from our selves, not from an *unjust*, and *implacable* Enemy. That the Blood is Spiritual, and that it is *inward* as well as *outward*, and *outward* as well as *inward*, I grant: But that the *outward* is a *Type*, is not the *saying* nor *meaning* of the Quakers; but a meaning *invented* by *G. Keith* to put a *Trick* upon us. He quotes *G. Whitehead*'s Book (Light and Life, p. 56.) both in his *Gross Error*, p. 17. and here, thus, *It is confessed, that God by his own Blood Purchased to himself a Church*, Acts, 20. 28. *Now the Blood of God, or that Blood that relates*

to

to God, must needs be Spiritual, he being a Spirit; and the Covenant of God is inward and Spiritual, and so is the Blood of it. Upon this, says G. Keith, Nar. p. 31. *So you see he doth not allow the Blood outwardly shed, to relate to God, or to be the Blood of the New Covenant, or that God Purchased his Church with that Blood outwardly shed on the Cross.* Why so, I pray? *G. Whitehead* said nothing *against the Blood outwardly shed on the Cross*; but, having to do with a Baptist, who would have the Blood to be *only outward*, and *not Spiritual*, and who (as G. *Whitehead* cites him in that 56 p.) confessed he was as *Ignorant of any such Blood as may be*, G. *Whitehead* asserted the Blood of God, by which he purchased to himself a Church and the Blood of the New Covenant, to be *Spiritual* (not *only outward*, as the Type of it was) And will *G. Keith* say, that the Blood of Christ which was outwardly shed, had *no Spirituality in it*, nor might in any *sense*, be called Spiritual, considering the *Miraculous conception* of the Body (whereof the Blood was a Principal part) through the overshadowing of the Power of the Highest. *G. Keith* might have remembred, that when he was in *The way to the City of God* (which now he hath turned his Back upon) he writ thus, p. 131. 'Even 'according to that Birth (to wit, his outward Birth) 'he was *the Son of God*, no less than the Son of Man, as 'having *God for his Father*, as he had the Virgin *Mary* 'for his Mother. Now the Child, we know, doth 'partake an Image, or Nature, from *both* Parents; and 'thus did Christ, who did partake of the Nature and 'Image of Man, from the Seed of *Mary*, but did par-'take of a Nature and Image, *much more excellent*, than 'that of Man, in its greatest Glory, from God and his 'Seed, who did really sow a most Divine and Heavenly 'Seed in the Virgin's Womb, which as it supplied the 'Males Seed, so it had much more in it, and brought 'forth a Birth, which as it had the true and whole Na-

'ture of Man, ſo I ſay, it had a perfection above it, and 'that not only in *accidental* Qualities (as men will readi-'ly confeſs) but even in *Subſtance* and *Eſſence*. But if he had forgotten this, yet he might have remembred, and ought to have conſidered, that Chriſt *having offered up himſelf through the Eternal Spirit to God*, the Blood that was outwardly ſhed, was included in that offering, as *part* thereof; and will he not admit that Blood, after it was offered up to God through the *Eternal Spirit*, to be called *Spiritual?*

In p. 32. he tells his Auditors, *You have had an account of them as to Juſtification* (and *a falſe account* too, ſay I;) *Now*, ſays he, *it is worth your while to ſee how theſe* [*pretended*] *infallible Men, contradict one another.* What more *frothy Flout* could the moſt *prophane Scoffer* at *Infallibility* have uſed? Is not this ſtrange *Language* from one, that in the ſame Breath (as it were, ſee p. 31.) ſaid, *I am a Quaker ſtill?* Truly if he were, I ſhould think the worſe of Quakeriſm (as he calls it) for his ſake. The Contradiction he pretends to find, *or rather make*, is between *W. Penn*, and *G. Whitehead* both, in anſwer to *Danſon*. He gives *W. Penn*'s words out of *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 82. thus, 'Rewardableneſs is a work 'without which God will not beſtow his Favour, and 'yet not the Meritorious Cauſe, for that there is no Pro-'portion betwixt the work that is *Finite* and *Temporary*, 'and the Reward which is *Infinite* and *Eternal*, &c. *G. Whitehead*'s words he gives out of a little Book called *The Voice of VViſdome*, p. 36. thus, 'The *Righteouſneſs* 'which God effects in us, is *not Finite*, but *Infinite*, for '*Chriſt is God's Righteouſneſs, and Chriſt is formed in us*, 'Gal. 4. 19. and ſo that Righteouſneſs which God works 'in us by his Spirit, is of the ſame kind and nature with 'that which worketh it, for the Saints are made Par-'takers of the Divine Nature, 2 *Pet.* 1. 4. *G. Keith* ſhould have obſerved, firſt that theſe words of *G. Whitehead*'s

Whitehead's (for he approves and highly commends *W: Penn* in this place: But his *Hosannah* has commonly a *Crucify* at the Tail of it) were a *Deduction* or *Inference* from *T. Danson*'s Affirmation, who had laid down, that the *Righteousness whereof Christ is the Subject, and that whereof he is the Efficient, are of one Species or kind.* From which *G. Whitehead* makes his Inference thus, Then say I, the Righteousness which God effects in us, is not Finite, but *Infinite: For Christ is God's Righteousness, and Christ is formed in us*, 2. Which takes away the *Contradiction* wholly, *W. Penn*, and *G. Whitehead* do not speak of one and the *same* thing. *W. Penn* speaks of the *works* which we *perform: G. Whitehead* speaks of *Christ, God's Righteousness, formed in us.* So the pretended Contradiction being removed, *G. Keith*'s *envious notes* thereupon fall with it, which only shew his *captious* nature and *cavilling* Spirit. He should have called to mind, that in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 24. he told *Cot. Mather*, 'That the nature of a Contradiction is difficult 'many times to understand, even in natural things, so 'that it is reckoned the Subtilleſt part of *Logick* or *Me*'taphysicks*, to understand throughly what are always 'Contradictions, and what not; And therefore much 'more hard it is, to understand in Spiritual things, that 'contain many seeming Contradictions. But this, now I think on't, was to *help himself off*, when *C. Mather* charged him with Contradicting himself.

In p. 33. he says, *Now I would hasten to a Conclusion.* And though he takes time to tell an *untruth* in the very entrance, saying, *I have proved to you, that they have excluded the Blood of Christ*, &c. Yet he makes so *much haste*, that going on to prove that we say, *we are not sanctified by that Blood*, he gives us *three pages*, but names no Book, out of which he takes them. *I shall read to you*, says he, *G. Whitehead*, p. 49, 50, 51. *Here's one Proof*, says he, *if ye think this is not enough, I will bring*

more. What ground they had to think that Proof enough, who heard it, I cannot tell. But I think no man by reading the *Narrative* can tell what to think of it: For he gives *neither the Book, nor the words*; but only the Authors name, and three pages. He brings one more, and that is out of *G. Whitehead*'s Book called *Light and Life*, p. 59. The Baptists words he gives thus, 'Neither *did I ever read that it was the Blood or Life of* 'Christ *in his People that we are Justified by.* See now the *Treachery* of this *false* Man, in setting down the Baptists words. The Baptist's words were, 'Neither 'did I ever read that it was the Blood or Life in Christ, 'or the Life of Christ in his People, that we are Justi-'fied by. He leaves out the words [*in Christ*] and makes it only the Blood or Life *of Christ in his People.* Whereas the Baptist's words import a denyal of Justification, not only by the Life of Christ in his People, but by the Blood or Life *in Christ himself.* For said the Baptist, *Neither did I ever read that it was the Blood or Life in Christ*, or the Life of Christ in his People, *that we are* Justified by. *G. W*'s answer he gives thus; 'The 'Spirit of Christ (which is Life) doth both Quicken, 'Sanctify and Justify, the true Believers, *John.* 6. 63. '1 *Cor.* 6. And that Blood and Water that is said to 'cleanse; is not of another *kind*, but *agrees in one* with 'the Spirit, all which is known within, and the effects 'thereof. Upon this *G. Keith* concludes thus, *So you see he takes it away from the outward Blood, and gives it to the inward Blood.* No such matter. He does *not divide* the *outward* Blood from the *inward*, with respect to the *Virtue* and *Efficacy* of it; Neither indeed, did he mention *outward* Blood, or *inward* Blood either, in this place. But he said, *The Spirit of Christ* (*which is Life*) *doth both quicken, sanctify and justify, the true Believers* (is not that true?) He said, *That Blood and Water that's said to cleanse, is not of another kind, but agrees in one with the Spirit* (is

not

not that true?) And he ſaid, *All which is known within the Quickening, the Sanctifying, the Juſtifying, the Cleanſing, and the Effects thereof, is known within* (is not that true alſo?) Whatever the *Efficient* be, the work is wrought *within*, and both the work, and the effects there of, is known *within*.

By this time his Auditors ſeem to be as weary of *G. Keith*, as he of the *work*. And therefore they bid him go to the next head; but being loth to loſe a Proof (as he calls it) he even *thruſts* it upon them. He intends this Proof againſt *W. Penn*, but *he names not the Book* he takes it out of, as he did not before upon *G. Whitehead*, which ſhews he was *in haſte indeed*. But giving the words, though not the Book (which he did not in the other Caſe) I have, from the Circumſtances of the matter, found his Quotation, in that Book of *W. Penn*'s called *Quakeriſm a New Nickname for Old Chriſtianity*, p. 149. It is upon a Paſſage which *J. Faldo* had quarrelled with and perverted in a Book of *Iſ. Penington*'s; which *G. K.* having occaſion to ſpeak of, makes as if he were ſo chary of *Iſaac Penington*, that he *would be loth ſo much as to mention him*; and ſays, *I charitably think this Paſſage dropt from him unawares*. Then adds, *I wiſh I could have that ground of Charity to others of them*. It ſeems his *Charity is very narrow*, if it can extend to *but one*, and he not living neither. But they are in *beſt caſe*, that have no need of his *Charity* (as the Quakers have not) for it is as *kind* as the *Crocodile's Tears*. But to his Proof, he begins it thus, J. Faldo *thinks that he has made Iſ. Penington his own. Can outward Blood waſh the Conſcience?* p. 29. *A plain Denyal*, ſays J. Faldo. *Here is* J. Faldo's *Commentary on* Iſ. Penington's *words*. Is this Intelligible? 'Tis a ſign by his *Confuſion he had enough of his work*. I muſt be fain to open the Paſſage and the occaſion of it, to make ſenſe of his words. *Iſaac Penington*, amongſt many other Queſtions to Profeſſors (who place all upon

the outward) put this Question, *Can outward Blood cleanse the Conscience? Can outward Water wash the Soul clean?* This *Jo. Faldo* (whom *G. Keith* no longer ago, than in 1692.) branded in Print for a most *partial and envious Adversary, known well enough to be possessed with Prejudice against us*, Serious Appeal p. 6. and p. 60.) catch hold of, and made this *false Comment* upon it, *A plain denyal of the Efficacy of the Blood of Christ shed on the Cross, to cleanse the Soul from the guilt of Sin, by its Satisfaction to the Justice of God.* What greater *perversion* could have been made! *G. Keith* probably saw this, and that his Auditors might not hear it, nor his Reader see it, he *huddled* through it in that *Confused* manner, that rendred it not *Intelligible.* For he gave no more of *Is. Penington*'s words, but *Can outward Blood wash* (for cleanse) *the Conscience.* And no more of *J. Faldo*'s, but *a plain Denyal*; without so much as saying what it was a denyal of. He gives *W. Penn*'s Reply some what fuller, but not so fully as I think fit to give it. For *W. Penn* (having shewed that *Is. Penington* did not speak of the outward Blood, with respect to *the taking away the guilt of Sin past*, but with *respect to Purgation, and Sanctification of the Soul from the present Acts and Habits of Sin that lodge therein*) says, 'Is he (*J. Faldo*) so Sottish as to make no distinction betwixt 'being *pardoned Sin past*, and the ground of it; and be-'ing *Renewed* and *Regenerated* in mind and Spirit, and 'the ground of that Conversion? (Now follow what *G. Keith* quotes) 'Or else is he so impiously unjust, 'that because we do deny, that outward Blood can be '*brought into the Conscience*, to perform that inward work '(which they themselves dare not, nay, do not hold) 'therefore *Is. Penington* denies *any Efficacy* to be in that '*outward* Offering and Blood *towards* Justification, as it 'respects meer Remission of former Sins and Iniquities? There *G. Keith* stops: But *W. Penn* added, 'We also say,

'say, That Christ's Blood had an Influence into Justifi-
'cation, as he phraseth it. Thus far *W. Penn.* And note, that this was spoken plainly and directly of the *outward* Blood, or Blood of the outward Body. Now *G. Keith* having given the Quotation short, says, *So in short, I take it thus:* W. Penn *answers, That* Is. Penington's *words are to be understood with reference to Sanctification, but not Justification* (Yes: Justification in *one* sense, but not in *every* sense.) Says he, *Outward Blood cannot be brought into the Conscience to perform that work* (But even the outward Blood had an Influence to Justification, said *W. Penn*) *But says* G. Keith, *The way that Blood has been brought into my Conscience, is by the application of a living Faith in Christ, whose Blood it was, the Spirit of God working that Faith in me.* But hath that Application (he speaks of) of Faith *really brought that Blood into his Conscience*, to perform the work of Sanctification there? If not (which to be sure it could not) Why does he say, The way *that Blood has been brought into my Conscience*; as if it had been *really* and *materially brought in there?* He says, *That Blood is not a Physical, but a Moral cause of our Cleansing.* But did he never know, (or pretend to know, and hold forth to others) Christ's Blood as a Physical cause of our Cleansing? He says, *Christ Jesus,* 1. *by his Obedience and Suffering, procured the Pardon of my Sins, as well as he Sealed it by his Blood.* And, 2. *He procured the Spirit to Sanctifie me.* So then it is the Spirit *within*, not the Blood *without*, to which he himself ascribes the *work* of Sanctification. Christ Jesus, by his Obedience and Suffering, *procured* the pardon of my Sins, says he, as well as he *Sealed* it by his Blood. And, 2. He *procured* the Spirit to Sanctifie me. Is it not plain from hence, that he makes the Obedience and Sufferings of Christ, the *cause* of the Pardon of Sin, and the Blood to be but as the *Seal* to that Pardon. But he attributes the *work* of Sanctification, to neither the one,

nor

nor the other; but *expresly to the Spirit*, which Christ procur'd, to Sanctify him? And I wish he had *given way to it*, that he might have been *Sanctified by it*; and then we should not have had such unsanctified work, (the Abuse, Wrong, and Injustice) from him that we have. He says, *I find none say, there must be a material Application of that Blood, but a Spiritual and Moral*; *and*, says he, *we can give Instances that Moral Causes are many times more Effectual Causes, than Physical are: As*, says he, *the Money wherewith we buy the Medicine that cures the Body, is not the Physical Cause of Health, but a Moral*; *and the Money that we buy Bread with, is not the Physical Cause of our Nourishment and Refreshment, but a Moral.* But does he think the Money wherewith the Medicine and Bread is bought, is a more Effectual Cause of Health and Nourishment, than the Medicine and Bread that is bought therewith? I am sure the Medicine and Bread are more *proximate* and *immediate* Causes of Health and Nourishment, than the Money; and if he having Money, could have neither Medicine nor Bread for his Money, he might perhaps be in as bad a Case, as they that have no Money. I expect he will (as he uses to do) *pay me off with* Ignorance and Folly, for questioning any thing of *his Philosophy*; But 'tis no matter if he do. I learnt when I was a Boy,

Stultitiam Simulare loco Prudentia Summa est.

That little Skill I have, I know when, where and how to use, and how to hide: It were well if he knew how to make better use, than he doth of his greater Stock. But Breaking off this short Digression, which I hope will be excused (for though I cannot dress out *Dishes*, nor serve them up so elegantly as he; yet I expect he should allow me,

Interferre

Interferre meis interdum gaudia curis.

He ſees I rather chuſe to change the *Verb*, than break the Poet's Head, and thereby hazard the breaking of my own, if I had chnaged the *Mood* of *Interpono*;) I return to the matter again; where I obſerve, that he makes the outward Blood, not at all the Efficient Cauſe (I mean the *worker*) of Sanctification in the Heart, but the Spirit, and the Blood *no more* the Cauſe of Sanctification, than *Money is the Cauſe* of Health and Nouriſhment to the Body, to wit, by *procuring* the Spirit to Sanctify, as Money *procures* Medicine and Bread to Cure and Nouriſh the Body. And in that ſenſe perhaps, as he ſays, he agrees with all true Chriſtians, we may agree with him; provided he will, under the Name of Blood, take in *the whole Offering* of Chriſt, his Obedience and Sufferings both *inwardly* and *outwardly*, and not divide *the Sacrifice*.

At the cloſe of this page, he tells his Auditors, he has now done with the two firſt Heads; and asks them, *Shall I go on to prove the other two, or ſhall we adjourn to another Day?* And truly his Auditors ſeem'd to have had ſo *fully enough* of that Days work, that they would rather endure the *Fatigue* of *one half Hour* more, than be *troubled with him another* Day; And bid him, *if half an Hour would do, go on.* So on he goes

The Third Head of *G. Keith*'s Charge, (viz. *That We deny the Reſurrection of the Body that dieth*) Conſidered.

The Third Head (ſays he, p. 34.) *to be proved, is, That the Body that dieth, riſeth not again. Firſt*, ſays he, *from W. Penn's holding the Reſurrection immediately after Death*

in

in his Rejoynder, p. 138. *I think*, adds he, *this will be enough for* W. Penn, *if I give no more.* It may be ſo indeed; but I don't think it will be enough for *G. Keith*, if he intends to make a Proof againſt *W. Penn* about the *Reſurrection*: For that place in that Book treats of the *Scriptures*; but *not a Word of the Reſurrection.* The poor Man in his *over-eager haſte*, miſtook his Books, and quoted *Rejoynder* inſtead of *Reaſon againſt Railing*; in which latter I have found the place he quotes. I defend Truth, and therefore need not take advantage of Errors of the Preſs (if this had been the Printers Error, as it is not, but his own fumbling miſtake) though he hath moſt unworthily done ſo againſt *G. Whitehead*, and that after it hath been proved unto him. Before I recite the Quotation (which I find he cited alſo before in his *Groſs Error*, p. 12. and perverted there as here) I cannot but take notice of the *Medium* he uſes to prove his Charge by, *viz. That* W. Penn *holds the Reſurrection immediately after Death.* So that *G. Keith* to prove *one* Charge, makes *another*, which *needs Proof* as much as the former. Now let us ſee how he attempts it. *T. Hicks*, ſays he, *argues thus for the Reſurrection of the Body*; *That if there be no Reſurrection of the Body, the Joys of Heaven ſhould elſe be imperfect.* Now here (ſays *G. Keith*) is *W. Penn*'s Anſwer to it, 'I 'anſwer, Is the Joy of the Antients now in Glory imper- 'fect? Or are they in Heaven but by halves? If it be ſo 'unequitable, that the Body which hath ſuffered, ſhould 'not partake of the Joys Cœleſtial, is it not in mea- 'ſure unequal that the Soul ſhould be rewarded ſo 'long before the Body? This Principle brings to the '*Mortality* of the Soul, (held by many Baptiſts) or I am 'miſtaken. But why muſt the Felicity of the Soul de- 'pead upon that of the Body? Is it not to make the Soul 'a kind of *Widow*, and ſo in a ſtate of Mourning and diſ- 'conſolateneſs to be without its beloved Body? Which 'ſtate is but a better ſort of Purgatory. Thus far he

'gives

gives out of *W. Penn*, then adds, *G. Whitehead* argues *the ſame way*; but does not tell where, naming neither Page nor Book. But he gives his words thus, 'If the 'deceaſed Saints in Heaven, or their Souls, have not all 'that they expect to all Eternity, all the Reſurrection 'they look for, then they muſt be in Purgatory for the 'time: But if the latter be not, then not the former. Upon this *G.K* ſays, *But this Contradicts many Scriptures, that eſpecially in* Act. 26. *That Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the Dead. Now*, ſays he, *according to this Doctrine of W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead, Chriſts Reſurrection was later than that of many Millions.* Tho' he has much *curtail'd W. Penn*'s Anſwer, and given no direction whereby to find *G. Whitehead*'s, (neither have I, upon diligent ſearch, found it, and *G. Whitehead* denies the words above given as his, to be his) yet from the words of each which he has given, I find that neither of thoſe Quotations will anſwer the End for which he brings them. They both relate to one and the ſame Objection, That if there be not a Reſurrection of the *ſame* Body, the Joys of Heaven ſhould be imperfect. To ſhew the *abſurdity* of that Objection, they both argued, That if the Joys of Heaven, to the Souls *already* in Heaven, depend upon the Reſurrection of the *ſame* Bodies in which thoſe Souls lived on Earth, then the Joys of Heaven, to the Saints already there, ſhould have been imperfect *hitherto*, and muſt continue to be imperfect, *until* the *ſame* Bodies ſhall be raiſed. But this does not at all conclude that they held the Reſurrection immediately after Death, but rather the contrary. For they did not argue, That the Souls of the deceaſed Saints have perfect Joy in heaven, becauſe their Bodies in which they lived on Earth have had a Reſurrection *already*, but becauſe the Joys of Heaven do not depend upon the Reſurrection of *thoſe* Bodies. This then is no proof that they held the Reſurrection immediately after Death, nor, conſe-

conſequently, that they contradicted that Scripture, *Acts* 26. That Chriſt ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the dead; which whether in a ſtrict Senſe he was, has been queſtioned by ſome, who have urged the Inſtance of *Lazarus* and ſome others before him.

But it ſeems as if he did not intend thoſe Words of *G. Whitehead* for a Proof; becauſe after he had paſſed his Sentence upon that, he ſays, *Now if you will hear a Proof from* G. Whitehead, *you may*; and cites p. 353. of the Book, called, the *Chriſtian Quaker*, &c. Where in Anſwer to *T. Danſon*'s, ſaying, 'The Happineſs of the 'Soul is not perfect without the Body, its dear and be-'loved Companion, the Soul having a ſtrong Deſire 'and Inclination to a Re-union to the Body, as the 'Schools not without ground determine, *vide Calvin.* He gives a part of *G. Whitehead*'s Anſwer (as alſo he did in his *Groſs Error*, p. 11.) thus, 'Both *Calvin*, *T.* '*Danſon*, and the Schools, and divers *Anabaptiſts*, are 'miſtaken in this very Matter, and ſee not with the 'Eye of true Faith, either that *the Happineſs of the Soul* '*is not perfect without the Body*, or that the Soul hath a '*ſtrong* Deſire to a Re-union to the Body, while they 'intend the *Terreſtrial*, *Elementary Bodies*: For this im-'plies the Soul to be in a kind of Purgatory or Diſqui-'etneſs, till the ſuppoſed Reſumption of the Body. This place (as that of *G. Whitehead*, and of *W. Penn* cited before) ſpeaks not of Reſurrection of the Body, but of the ſuppoſed *Imperfection of the Souls Happineſs* without the Body, and the ſtrong Deſire they fancy it hath to a Re-union to the Body; which the immediately following Part of *G. Whitehead*'s Anſwer (left wholly out by *G. Keith* here, and not fully given in his *Groſs Error*, though he confidently ſays, *Nar.* p. 37. *I have quoted full Periods at length*) plainly ſhews: For ſays *G. Whitehead* there; 'And their Aſſertion and 'Determination therein, is contrary to what the Apoſtle

ſaith

ſaith, 2 *Cor.* 5. *For we know, that if our earthly Houſe of this Tabernacle were diſſolved, we have a building of God, an Houſe not made with Hands, Eternal in the Heavens,* ver. 1. *For we that are in this Tabernacle, do groan, being burdened,* &c. *ver.* 4. *We are confident, I ſay, and willing rather to be abſent from the Body, and to be preſent with the Lord,* ver. 8. And ſaid he (the Apoſtle) *I am in a ſtrait betwixt two, having a deſire to depart,* &c. *Phil.* 1, 23. It is manifeſt, I ſay, from hence, that *G. Whitehead*'s Words (cited by *G. Keith*) related directly to that *Notion* of *T. Danſon* and others, That the Happineſs of the Soul is not perfect without the Body, and that the Soul hath a ſtrong Deſire to a Re-union to the Body, to which he oppoſed thoſe Words of the Apoſtle before recited. Yet from hence *G. Keith* tells his Hearers; *You ſee, I hope, here is Proof enough, that* G. Whitehead *holds, that the deceaſed Saints look for no Reſurrection of the Body.* But in this he concludes unfairly: For the Words he gives for Proof, do not prove he held ſo.

Here *G. Keith* was put in Mind, it ſeems, that *G. Whitehead*, ſaid *Elementary Bodies* (which he did and *Terreſtrial* alſo) to which *G. Keith* replies, *What other Body could it be?* As much as to ſay, *What other Body could the Soul deſire to be re-united to, but a Terreſtrial, Elementary Body?* For of ſuch Bodies *G. Whitehead* ſpake, as the Soul was ſaid to have a ſtrong deſire of re-union to, which was the *Terreſtrial, Elementary Body*, which *T. Danſon* ſaid *had been it's dear and beloved Companion.* So that, it ſeems, according to *G. Keith*, it muſt be a *Terreſtrial, Elementary Body after it is re-united* to the Soul in Heaven. What other Body could it be, ſays *G. Keith?* But he is fain *to ſtep down into his Ditch*, to fetch up a little of his *Ditch-Philoſophy* to make it out by. *I hope*, ſays he, *a little Philoſophy will not offend you. The Objection*, ſays he, *they make, is the ſame againſt Chriſt's*

Christ's Body. Pray, says he, *Was not Christ's Body Elementary? Did he not Eat and Drink? And was it not the same as we Eat and Drink? And if we Eat and Drink of what are Elementary, then his Body did receive the same Elements, and they were converted into his Body. First*, let me tell him, the Objection made against a *Resurrection* of *Terrestrial*, *Elementary* Bodies, is not *the same* against Christ's Body. For there was a *difference* between Christ's Body, and the Bodies of other Men. His was a *more excellent* Body, with respect to its *Generation*. *G. Keith* hath said it, *Way to the City of God*, p. 134. 'And thus he was both the *Son of God*, and 'the Son of Man, according to his very Birth in *Ma-'ry*: And therefore even according to *that Birth*, he 'hath a *Divine Perfection* and Vertue, and that *Substan-'tial*, above all other Men that ever were, are, or shall 'be. And in p. 135. 'His Body hath not only the 'Perfections of our Body, but also *much more*, because 'of its being *generate*, not only of a Seed of *Mary*, but 'of a *Divine Seed*. This made him contend against the Word *Humane*, as too mean a Title for the outward and visible Flesh which Christ took of the Virgin, *Rector Corrected*, p. 27, *&c.* But now calls Christ's Body not only Elementary, but plainly *Terrestrial*.

He says, *G. Whitehead* owns in his *latter* Writings, that Christ's Body that rose, is *the same* with his Body that suffered. Here he uses the Word [*Latter*] deceitfully and *maliciously*, to insinuate, as if *G. Whitehead* had not owned this till *now of late*; whereas he could not but know, that in a Postscript to a Book, called, *The Malice of the Independent Agent rebuked*, written in the third Month, 1678. which is *eighteen Years ago*, *G. Whitehead* (for to him *G. Keith* ascribes that Postscript) said, *Christ did rise in that Body wherein he suffered, and in the same ascended into the Heavens*. I say *G. Keith* could not but know this, because in his Book called,

The

The true Copy (Printed but last Year) p. 21. he quoted a Passage, as *G. Whitehead's*, out of that very Postscript. But says he in p. 35. *his Pride will not suffer him to own his forme Error, either in that, or in other things.* I may rather say of *G. Keith*, His *Envy* will not suffer him to be *Just* or *Honest*. For he can no where find in any of *G. Whitehead's* Writings, that he did ever *disown* Christ's Body that rose, to be the *same* Body that suffered. But there is not an equal Comparison betwixt Christ's Body and Man's. His *saw no Corruption.* But Man's Body is subject to Corruption and Putrefaction.

In p. 35. He says, *And seeing* W. Penn *thinks it absurd that a Body can be transformed from an Earthly and Animal Body to an Heavenly Body, as* (says he) *he argueth*, Reason against Railing, p. 134. *He makes it not only as gross as Transubstantiation, but worse. But this* (says he) *is his gross Ignorance in true Philosophy, and his false Philosophy destroys his Faith.* But what, I wonder, has *destroyed* G. Keith's *Honesty*, except it be his *gross Enmity?* For he has most *grossly abused* W. Penn in this Passage. Where doth *W. Penn* say, or hold, *it is absurd that a Body can be transformed from an Earthly or Animal Body to an Heavenly Body?* There is no Word in the Place cited, nor any where that I know of, that either speaks so, or has a tendency that way. But that which *W. Penn* reputed *absurd* was, that a Body should be said to be *changed from an Earthly* or Animal Body to an *Heavenly* Body, and yet *after such change* continue to be *the same Earthly* or Animal Body that it was before. This is that of which *W. Penn* said, *How is it possible, that it should be the same, and not the same?* And *if a thing can yet be the same, and notwithstanding changed, for shame let us never much so make stir, against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.* And indeed, as easily may *G. Keith* defend the one as the other. And if, among

those of the Protestant Parties he now Courts, he should miss of the *End* of his turning from the *Quakers*, it is not altogether unlikely, but that he may try *what Earnings he can make* among them that hold that Doctrine. He says, *It is not Transubstantiation, if I say, a Saint's Body is the same at the Resurrection for Substance, as it was when it went into the Grave, leaving the faces or drossie Part of it behind.* I say, that is beside the Question. But the Question is, Whether a *Natural* or *Carnal Body* (that is, a Body *consisting of Flesh, Blood and Bones*) can be *raised out of the Grave without Flesh, Blood and Bones*, and yet be properly and truely said to be *the same natural or carnal Body*, that it was *while it consisted of Flesh, Blood* and *Bones?* For if he would argue from the *Substance* of a Body, he should first have *defined* what the Substance of a *Natural* or *Carnal* Body is, that it might have been agreed; whether the *Faces* or drossy Part (as he calls it, by which I understand him to mean the *Flesh, Blood and Bones*) *be* the *Substance*, or *any Part* of the Substance, of a *Natural* or *Carnal* Body. He seems to hold that it is not: For he blames *W. Penn* for holding, that *Carniety is essential to a Carnal Body* (that is, that *Flesh is essential to a Body of Flesh*) and he says thereupon, *see how contrary this is to common Sense and Understanding.* But sure I think every one that has but common Sense and Understanding, may have ground to Question, Whether he has not lost his. To manifest how contrary it is to common Sense and Understanding (and withal to give his Auditors to understand, that he is not only a *mickle Philosopher*, but a little Piece of an *Hen-Housewife* too) he says, *There is no Woman that sets an Hen to breed Chickens, but knows the contrary. You know*, says he, *the Substance of the Egg (the White and Yolk) by the force and heat of the Hen sitting on the Egg, is changed into a Chicken. Is here*, says he, *any Transubstantiation?* First, observe he grants the

White

White and the Yolk to be the *Substance* of the Egg. Next, that this *Substance* of the Egg, the *White* and the *Yolk*, is *changed* into a *Chicken*. Now unless he will affirm, that the *Substance* of a *Chicken*, after it comes to be a Chicken, is the *White* and *Yolk*, I see not how he will avoid a *Transubstantiation*, that is, a *changing* of the *Substance* of the *Egg*, which was *White* and *Yolk*, into the *Substance* of a *Chicken*, which of all the Chicken I have eaten of, I always took to be *Flesh*, *Blood* and *Bones*. If he thinks otherwise, and it should ever happen that he and I should be *Fellow-Commoners* at a Chicken, let him but let me have what I call the *Substance* of it, and I will readily *resign* all the rest to him, even the *White* and the *Yolk*, if he can find it, and, in requital of his *Courtesie*, some part (and the most *solid*) of that which I call the *Substance* too, which will not be unsuitable to a *Cynical* Philosopher. But whereas he makes himself a little sport with *W. Penn*'s Philosophy, he might have considered, that what *W. Penn* writ on that subject was not to entertain the Schools, but to inform common and vulgar Capacities; and therefore he handled it Scripturally, not Philosophically, using the Terms he writ in, according to the ordinary Signification, and common Acceptation of them.

What he says of a *Chymical Operation*, I take to be but a *Chymical Whimsie* in his Head, or a *Chimera*, which he pleases, *viz. That a gross Body of Herbs, or other Substance, can by Chymical Operation be made so subtile, volatile, and spiritual (without any Transubstantiation, or Change of the Substance) that a Glass can scarce confine, or hold it.* I don't think *many* have that understanding, that he pretends to have of *Chymical Operations*. That a subtile, volatile, *spirituous Substance* may by *Chymical* Operation, be *extracted* from a *gross Substance* or Body of Herbs, is easily apprehensible. And that which is so *extracted* is usually called *the Spirit of*

that Body out of which it is drawn, *not the Body it ſelf*. But that the *groſs Body it ſelf* of Herbs, or other Subſtance, can be made *ſo ſubtile* and volatile, as ſcarce to be contained in a Glaſs, requires better Proof, to gain belief, than his bare ſaying it. Beſides, if the groſs Body be made ſo ſubtile and volatile, as he ſays, how is the *Faces* or droſſy part left behind, as he ſays. But that which muſt make his *Chymical Conceit* beat any *right Parallel* with that *Notion* of the *Reſurrection*, which *VV. Penn* oppoſed, muſt be, that this *groſs Body* of Herbs, which he ſays, may be made ſo ſubtile and volatile, muſt *ſtill remain the ſame groſs Body* of Herbs, that it was before, notwithſtanding its almoſt unconfinable ſubtility by Chymical Operation; as they hold the Body that dies and is laid in the Grave, to be *changed* in the Reſurrection, and yet to be *the ſame Body* after the Reſurrection, as it was when it died, and was laid in the Grave. This is that which *VV. Penn* compared to the *Abſurdity* of the *Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation*; the *Folly* of which *Doctrine*, (not to meddle here with the *Impiety* of it) lies in this, that the *Patrons* of that *Opinion* affirm the *very Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *VVine*, (after the Words of *Conſecration*, as they call them, are ſpoken) to be *really changed* into the *very Subſtance* of Chriſt's Body, and yet the *Accidents* of the Bread and Wine enforce the Senſes to confeſs, that the *Subſtance* of the *Bread* and *VVine*, *remains* in them as before.

I perceive he has done, and that quickly, with his Third Head, about the *Reſurrection*. Which, *as he has ſtated it*, he needed not at all have attempted to prove our denial of. For it is a known thing, that as we have always aſſerted a *Reſurrection of Bodies*, ſo we have always denied the Body which ſhall be raiſed to be *the ſame Body* that died, with reſpect to Groſneſs and Carniety; and that, 1. From the *Principles* of our *Oppoſers* about it, who hold that it is *wonderfully changed*,

and

and therefore it is a *wonder* it ſhould be the *very ſame*. 2. From the *Reaſon* and *Nature* of the thing, which will not admit a *Natural*, *Carnal* Body to be a *ſuitable Habitation* for a *Glorified* Soul in Heaven to dwell in, nor to be *the ſame* Body, that it was when it was a *Natural* and *Carnal* Body, if it *ceaſe to be a Natural and Carnal* Body, and be made *wholly Spiritual*. 3. From the *uncontroulable Teſtimony* of the Holy Apoſtle, who ſays, *expreſly*, That *Fleſh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, 1 Cor. 15. 50. And by a *Metaphor* borrowed from *Agriculture*, ſays, *That which thou ſoweſt* (which is the Body that dies and is put into the Grave) *thou ſoweſt not that Body that ſhall be*, ver. 37. which is alike, as if he had ſaid in ſo many Syllables, *The Body that ſhall ariſe, is not the* ſame Carnal *Body that dies, and is put into the Grave*. No, the Body that is put into the Grave (or is ſown) is a *Natural* Body: But the Body that is raiſed is a *Spiritual* Body. *It is ſown a Natural Body, it is raiſed a ſpiritual Body*, ſays the Apoſtle, *ver.* 44. And that none might think this *ſpiritual* Body was *the ſame* with the *Natural* Body, he adds, *There is a Natural Body, and there is a ſpiritual Body*. He does not ſay, *the Natural is made a ſpiritual* Body, or the Natural Body and the Spiritual Body is but *one and the ſame* Body. But he ſets them in *Oppoſition*, as *two diſtinct* Bodies. *There is a Natural Body, and there is a Spiritual Body*. The Apoſtle illuſtrates this Difference between the Body that dies, (or is ſown) and the Body that is raiſed, from the *two Adams*, the firſt and the laſt, ſaying, *The firſt Man* Adam *was made a living Soul, the laſt* Adam *was made a quickening Spirit*, ver. 45. Is this *quickening Spirit* the *ſame* with that *living Soul*? Is the *laſt* Adam, and the *firſt* Adam, but *one and the ſelf ſame* Adam? *The firſt Man is of the Earth Earthly, the ſecond Man is the Lord from Heaven*, ver. 47. Will *G. Keith* ſay, This *ſecond* Man, which is the Lord

from Heaven, is *the same* with the *First* Man, which is of the Earth Earthy? *As is the Earthy, such are they also that are Earthy; and as is the Heavenly, such are they also that are Heavenly*, ver. 48. Does not the Apostle here plainly shew, that as the *second* Man, the Lord from Heaven, is *not the same* with the *first Man* of the Earth Earthy: So the *Heavenly* Bodies which the Saints *shall* have, are *not the same* with the *Earthy* Bodies which they *have* had? *And*, says he, *as we have born the Image of the Earthy, we shall also bear the Image of the Heavenly*, ver. 49. This shews we shall bear the Image of *another* Body in *Heaven*, than that which we bore on the *Earth*, consequently not the Image of the *same* Body. But if by *Heavenly* Body were meant *the same* Body that was *Earthy*, then we should bear the Image of *the same* Body *hereafter* in Heaven, which we *have born* here on *Earth*, quite contrary to the Apostle's Doctrine; who to clear the matter fully, that in all this Discourse of his about the Resurrection, he did not mean *the same* Body of Flesh and Blood that *dies* should be raised, concludes thus, *ver.* 50. *Now this I say, Brethren, that Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.* But the Body that dies every one knows is a Body of *Flesh and Blood*, therefore, *that Body* cannot inherit the Kingdom of God; but it must be *a Body* which is *not of Flesh and Blood*, and that cannot be the Body of Flesh and Blood that dies.

This is so fully handled in those Books of *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead* (out of which *G. Keith* took his pretended Proofs) as well as in other Books of theirs, that *G. Keith* needed not have *fetched a Round* to prove it, by alledging that they hold the Resurrection immediately after Death, but that he had a Mind to fix (if he could) that *slander* on them, which they no where say, nor do the Places he has quoted prove it: For they therein only argued against the *absurd* and gross *Notion*

of

of their Opponents, which was, that the Body which is raised, is *the same Carnal Body*, that Died and was Buried; which he, if he have a Mind, may undertake the Proof of. But though we cannot subscribe to that gross and *carnal Notion*; yet both the Quakers in general, and they in particular, do own, and always have owned, *a Resurrection*, and that *of Bodies*. So said *W. Penn* in the Book *G. Keith* quoted (or should have quoted, if he had not mistaken, and quoted another for it) *Reason against Railing*, p. 133. 'We do acknowledge a Resurrection in order to Eternal Recompence, 'and that every Seed shall have its own Body; and we 'rest contented with what Body it shall please God to 'give us. But as we are not such *Fools*, as *curiously* to 'enquire *What*; So must we for ever deny the *gross* '*Conceits* of *T. Hicks* and his Adherents (of whom *G. Keith* is now become one) concerning the Resurre'ction. And having refuted those *gross Conceits* he spoke of, he concluded thus, in p. 140. 'For our parts, '[illegible]*rrection we believe*, and *of Bodies too*, unto Eter'[illegible]e. What they shall *not* be, I have briefly said '[illegible]roved; what they shall be, we leave with God, '[illegible] will give every one a Body as pleaseth him; and '[illegible] Fool, belongs to the unnecessary medler. *G Keith* himself, but a while ago, undertook *W. Penn's* Defence in this Point of the Resurrection, against *Cotton Mather*, in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 9. where he says, 'As for his citing *W. Penn's* Words arguing against 'that *same Numerical Body* its rising at the Resurrecti'on, it is clear that he understandeth the same exact 'Number of the small Particles or Dusts, neither more 'nor less than what is commonly buried; and *what hurt* '*is there in that?* Said *G. Keith* then. If *G. Keith* has a Mind now to maintain and defend the contrary, and will undertake to prove that it is the *same Numerical Body*, with all its Numerical Particles, that rises, which

was buried, let him do it *Scripturally*, not only *Philosophically* (and that by false Notions of Philosophy) lest he make People suspect he intends only a *Resurrection of Philosophers*, or at most but a *Philosophical Resurrection*. I advise him to keep to *Scripture-Terms*, because he hath so often recommended that to others, and blamed his Opponents formerly for going from it. And particularly in his Book, called, *Truth's Defence*, p. 169. is Positive, 'That *all* the Principles and Doctrines of the 'Christian Faith, which God requireth in common of all 'Christians, are *expresly* delivered and recorded in the 'Scriptures; and therefore, says he there, for my part, '*what I cannot find expresly delivered in Scripture, I see no 'Reason why I should receive or believe as any common Ar-'ticle or Principle of the Christian Faith or Life.* The Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead, is a *common* Article of the Christian Faith, which we find *expresly* delivered in the Scriptures, and accordingly we *sincerely believe* it. But we do not find it *expresly* delivered in the Scriptures, that the Body that shall be raised is the *very same Body* that died; but we find the *quite contrary* expresly delivered in Scripture [*Thou sowest not that Body that shall be*, 1 Cor. 15. 37.] And therefore we see no Reason (any more than *G. Keith* formerly did) to receive or believe it as a common Article or Principle of the Christian Faith, much less that we should be blamed for not so receiving it; and least of all by him, who hath provided so good a Defence for himself, against being blamed for not receiving as an Article of the Christian Faith, what he cannot find *expresly* delivered in the Scripture.

I could shew a great deal of *Absurdity and Self-contradiction* of *G. Keith*'s in what he has delivered on this Subject of the *Resurrection*. But I am unwilling to spend time, or too much to enlarge the Bulk of these Sheets, which are already increast beyond my Expectation when

I began, by my giving particular and full Anſwers to the foregoing Heads. I ſhall therefore in the Remainder, contract my Anſwers as much as well I may, and either paſs wholly over the *lighter* parts of his Narrative, or touch but *lightly* on them.

Towards the bottom of p. 35. having done with the Doctrine of the Reſurrection, he takes an occaſion to give another *Flurt* at *Infallibility*, though not relating to any of his four Heads or Charges; which makes me think he did it to *gratifie* the more *prophane* and looſe party of his Auditors, as knowing that ſuch Perſons uſe to *ſcoff* at *Inſpiration* and *Infallibility*, to whom he was willing by that means to *endear* himſelf, and them to him. He takes his occaſion from a Paſſage in a Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, mentioned before, called, *The Voice of Wiſdom*, in Anſwer to *T. Danſon*, where p. 33. to the Prieſt's ſaying, *Our want of Infallibility is no valid Plea againſt our Miniſtry*; G. Whitehead anſwered, *His falſhood here appears plainly, for they that want Infallibility, and have not the Spirit of Chriſt, they are out of the Truth, and are fallible, and their Miniſtry is not of the Spirit, ſeeing they ſpeak not from the Spirit, but from their own Hearts, which are deceitful, where they want Infallibility.* The Inference *G. Keith* makes from hence is this, *Now, I hope*, ſays he, *I have proved they want Infallibility, and therefore by their own Doctrine, they are no true Miniſters of Chriſt.* But his Conſequence will not hold: For it depends not upon *certainty*, but *hope*, and *falſe hope* too. He hopes he has proved they want Infallibility: But his Hope is but the *Hope of an Hypocrite*, which will periſh, as he alſo will, unleſs he repent. If *Infallibility* be ſo *ludibrious* a thing with him, how comes it to paſs that he hath not yet *openly renounced* what he has formerly written in Defence of *Divine Inſpiration*, *Immediate Revelation*, and *Infallibility*, who perhaps has writ more on thoſe Subjects, than any Quaker has done?

In

In p. 36. I observe a Passage dropt from a Friend of ours, that happened to be present, thus, *I do not know but you will find, when you have an Answer to what* G. Keith *has offered, that those he Charges and Paraphrases on, will agree with him in Principles.* He that spake this, must be understood to mean, *If* G. Keith *will agree with himself in Principles*, that is, will own the same Principles now, which he owned, maintained and defended while he was a Quaker, which as *G. Keith* had not openly renounced; so neither did that Friend of ours know whether he would or no. The *Stranger* therefore, that in p. 37. undertook to Answer in *G. Keith's* behalf, did somewhat mistake the Matter, when from those Words [I do not know but you will find, they whom he Charges will agree with him in Principles] he infer'd [*You say that he differs not from you in Principles.*] Nor was he less out in concluding, that that was *to clear him from the Charge of Apostasie*: For It was aptly replied by another, *There is an Apostasie from the Spirit of Christianity, as well as from the Principles.* But that *Stranger* was strangely out, who in p. 45. said, *For a Man to Apostatize, is to Apostatize from the whole Faith; but for a Man to differ with respect to particular things, this is not Apostasie.* He might have consider'd, that Apostasie is either General, or Special. Apostasie *General*, is that which he calls an Apostasie *from the whole Faith*, which I think cannot be properly said of any but such, as wholly renounce the Christian Religion, in all parts of its Profession, and turn *Jews* or *Infidels*. But if any who have profest the Protestant Religion, and held Communion with Protestants under any particular Denomination, should renounce Protestantism, and turn Papist, I presume any considerate Protestant would account such an one an Apostate; and yet such an one could not be rightly said to have apostatized from the whole Christian Faith, inasmuch as the Church

Church of *Rome* (as Corrupt as she is) doth hold divers Articles of the Christian Faith, in Common with all Protestants. But since Apostasie, in the common acceptance of the Word, and from the Etymon thereof, Signifies a *departing*, or *Falling* off, from that Religious Society, or Body of People, to which a man was before joyned, and it is evident G. *Keith* is fallen off and departed from the Society of the People called Quakers, to which he was once joyned; he comes properly under the Denomination of an Apostate, and it is no Injury to him, to call him so.

In p. 37. he repeats the *Story* which he formerly told, of the Man, that, he says, told him, he would rather Die, or lose his right Hand, than sign a Sentence (as he calls it) against him: And that man, he says, has since come to him, and told him, he did not joyn in the Judgment given against him. Whether this latter part be true I know not, nor much regard, knowing what a sort of *unstable man* that has been. But of the rest of that matter, so far as it did concern the Meeting, I have given so *particular* and *full* an account, in my former Book called *Truth Defended*, p. 64, 65, 66, 67. as I doubt not will give Satisfaction to any unbyassed Reader, whether I refer such, that I may not spend time upon so impertinent a matter here, as I perceive some of his Auditors judged it: For after he had ended his relation of it, one of his Auditors, whom he calls a Stranger, said, *All this is very Impertinent to the Business in Hand.* Yet I find he ran on in a loose way of telling Stories against the Quakers, both the rest of that page, and p. 38.

Towards the bottom of that page, he tells a *Story* of three Ministers of *London* that in the Year 1678. Rose up (he says) against him, and he opposed their Errors. Being asked by an Auditor, *What Ministers they were?* He readily answered, *They were Quakers.* But being put

put upon it, *and preſt hard to tell their Names*, he ſaid, *I will not do it, it is not convenient; there is one of them a Citizen of very good repute, and therefore it will be better to conceal his name.* Can there be any thing but *Hypocriſy* in this pretence? For is not *G. Whitehead a Citizen of very good repute alſo?* And yet ſo far has *G. Keith* been from *concealing* his name, that he has endeavoured to *blemiſh* his name as much as in him lies, and to *load* him with *Infamy* and *Slander*. Beſides, being urged again to tell his name, He anſwers, *I think it not convenient, we muſt uſe a little Policy as well as you.* This more fully ſhews his *Deceit*, who before pretended *Charity* in concealing the Perſons names, but now diſcovers the *Ground thereof was Policy*. But to be ſure he ſhewed no Policy in that. I might juſtly enough reject this ſtory wholly, and tell him, as he did his Countryman *John Alexander* (who charged a Miſinterpretation of Scripture upon ſome of the Quakers, without naming whom) '*Seeing he has produced no names*, of any among us, un-'derſtanding that, *&c. We are not concern'd to anſwer him*, Truth's Defence, p. 67. And again, in p. 77. to a like Charge made by *J. Alexander* againſt ſome Quakers without naming them, He ſays, '*He ought* '*to have produced their names, or we are not bound to be-*'*lieve him, that any have ſaid ſo.* May I not with as good reaſon, ſay ſo to *G. Keith* in this Caſe, eſpecially ſeeing he refuſed to name them, tho' ſo earneſtly preſſed to it? As he ſays, they were three Miniſters, ſo he charges them with three great Errors. 1. That they ſaid Chriſt's Body did never riſe out of the Grave. 2. That they denied it was lawful to pray to Jeſus Chriſt Crucified 3. That they could come to God without the Mediator, the Man Chriſt Jeſus. Theſe are ſo Contrary to our known Principles, that I cannot believe his Charge to be true, as he has given it. He ſays, he can appeal to *W. Penn*, and *G. Whitehead*. But

is

is it not ſtrange, he ſhould pick out them two (from amongſt forty or fifty, that he ſays were preſent) to appeal to, when he has made them the common Butts, to ſhoot the Arrows of his Envy at, through the greateſt part of his Narrative? Could he find none to appeal to, out of forty or fifty, but them? Well, I have enquired of them both, Concerning it. *W. Penn* ſaith, he doth not Remember it. *G. Whitehead* doth Remember that ſome (but not near ſo many as *G. Keith* mentions) had ſome Diſcourſe with him about that time, upon ſomething that he had written; but that any of them ſaid, Chriſt's Body did never riſe out of the Grave; Or, that they could come to God, without the Mediator, the Man Chriſt Jeſus; Or, that *Paul* was Dark and Ignorant, (which in Nar. p. 38, 39. *G. Keith* Charges on them) he ſays, He neither heard, nor doth believe. But that ſome Diſcourſe did paſs betwixt him, and them, Concerning praying to Chriſt, he doth Remember; but believes it was not altogether as *G. Keith* hath related it. However it was, I obſerve, that in one part of that Story (even as *G. Keith* hath given it) he clears *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, and repreſents them as taking part with him, againſt thoſe others, who he ſays oppoſed him. For he here ſays, that (upon their denying that it was lawful to Pray to Jeſus Chriſt Crucified, and daring him to give an Inſtance of one *Engliſh* Quaker that he ever heard Pray to Chriſt) *W. Penn* ſaid, I am an Engliſh Man, and a Quaker, and I own I have oft Prayed to Jeſus Chriſt, even him that was Crucified. And that *G. Whitehead*, to prove the lawfulneſs thereof, took the Bible, and Read 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. To all that call upon the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, both their Lord, and ours. It is evident from hence, that both *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead* did, in *G. Keith*'s ſence and defence, own Chriſt, even him that was Crucified, to be the Object of Faith, and that not only

now

now of late, (as *G. Keith* would have it) but so long ago as 1678. which is Eighteen Years past. This quite overthrows all he has said before, of their denying the Object of Faith, and may well pass, with all Ingenuous Readers, for a full Confutation of all his Clamours upon that Head against them. But though he has hereby acquitted them; yet I see not how he will *acquit* himself. For this he says, was in 1678. which was *Eighteen Years* ago; and yet in 1692. which was but *four Years* ago, he told *Cotton Mather* in Print, 'That according 'ing to the best knowledge he had of the People called 'Quakers, and these most generally owned by them, 'as Preachers, and Publishers of their Faith, of unquestioned esteem among them, and worthy of double 'Honour, (as many such there are) he knew *none* that 'were guilty of any one of such Heresies and Blasphemies as he accuseth them, *Serious Appeal* p. 7. And to shew that he had ground for what he said, he added a little lower in the same page, 'And I think I should 'know, and do know, these called Quakers, better 'than *C. Mather* or any or all his Brethren, having 'been Conversant with them in *Publick Meetings*, as well 'as in *private Discourses*, with the most noted and esteemed among them, for about twenty-eight Years past, 'and that in many places in the World in *Europe*, and 'and for these divers Years in *America*. What must we think of this? That he *writ a Falsehood then*, or *spake a Falsehood now?* But be that as it will.

The Fourth, and last Head of *G. Keith*'s Charge, (*viz. That we deny Christ's Coming without us, in his Glorified Body, to Judge the Quick and the Dead*) Considered.

In p. 39. he says, *I will cite a passage or two out of a Manuscript from* Pensilvania, but instead of that says,

See

See the Book called Light and Life, p. 41. *See what is here said by* G. Whitehead, *That there is not an outward coming of Christ to Judge the Quick and the Dead. What I prove from* G. Whitehead, says he, *is proved from* W. Penn, *for* W. Penn *has Authorized his Book.* This he has hinted in several places of his Narrative, referring sometimes to p. 185, 186. of *Reason against Railing*, where *W. Penn* mentioned divers Books, which he referr'd the Adversaries to, in defence of our Principles. I presume he will find no cause to be sorry for having mentioned any of those Books, unless it be such as *G. Keith* was either solely, or partly, the Author of. But if *W. Penn*'s so mentioning those Books, doth so *Instile* him to them, as to render him *accountable* for whatsoever is in them; I would know of *G. Keith*, why he should not, for the same reason, be *accountable* for whatsoever is in those Books, which *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* have written in Answer to *T. Hicks* and *J. Faldo*, since he, *with as much Approbation*, has mentioned those Answers, in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 6. and 60. and yet those are some of the principal Books he picks his Cavils out of, against G. *Whitehead* and *W. Penn*.

Now let us see how G. *Keith* deals with G. *Whitehead* in the Quotation he brings against him. Observe that first, he says, *See what is here said by* G. Whitehead, *That there is not an outward Coming of Christ, to Judge the Quick and Dead*; therefore look well to his Quotation, and mind to find *those words* in it. He begins the Quotation thus, *Moreover, Christ said, the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his Father with his Angels*, &c. There G. *Keith* stops with an *&c.* Citing *Matt.* 16.27,28, *Luke* 9. 26, 27. But leaves out the remaining words in those Scriptures, which in *Matthew* follow thus, [*And then he shall Reward every Man according to his Works. Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here, which shall not taste of Death, till they see the Son of*

of Man coming in his Kingdom] Why G. *Keith* left out these words, I may shew anon. Now he goes on with G. *Whitehead*'s words, thus, 'Now what is that Glory 'of the Father, in which his Coming is? Is it Visible 'to the *Carnal Eye*? And when was that coming to be? 'Is it *now* to be looked for outwardly? But farther we 'do acknowledge the several comings of Christ, accord-'ing to the Scriptures, both that in the *Flesh*, and that 'in the *Spirit*, which is Manifest in several degrees, as 'there is a growing from Glory to Glory. But three 'Comings of Christ, [not only that in the Flesh at *Je-'rusalem*, and that in the Spirit; but also another com-'ing in the Flesh, yet to be expected] we do not Read 'of, but a Second Coming without Sin unto Salva-'tion, which in the Apostles Days, was looked for, '(this latter Clause he cited before in his *Gross Errror*, p. 2.)

Now, Reader, observe, First, That *those words G. Keith* charges to be here *said* by *G. Whitehead*, *viz.* That *there is not an outward Coming of Christ to judge the Quick and the Dead*, are not here: That's but an Inference of *G. Keith*'s own making, though he unfairly pretended *G. Whitehead said it*. Next he left out those words in the Text, *Mat.*16.28. *Verily I say unto you, There are some standing here which shall not taste of Death, until they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom.* Upon which words those Questions of *G. Whitehead* were grounded, When was that coming to be? Is it *now* to be looked for outwardly? For that coming there spoken of by Christ, *Mat.*16.27. could not be meant of his coming *at the end of the World*, because it was to *begin in that very Age*, some *then* living and present with him, were to see it *before they died: There are some standing here, which shall not taste of Death, until they see the* Son *of Man coming in his Kingdom.* By his Kingdom, saith *Beza*, is to be understood *the Glory of his Ascension, and what followeth thereof, Ephes.* 4. 10.

4.10. *or the Preaching of the Gospel.* In the latter part of the Quotation, G. *Whitehead* had respect to the Baptists *Notion* of an *Outward Personal Coming of Christ* in a *Fleshly* Appearance, to reign on Earth *a thousand years.* And it is with relation to *such a manner* of coming in an *outward Body of Flesh*, to reign *Personally* on Earth, for a certain time, as an *Outward King*, that he there said (after he had acknowledged the several Comings of Christ according to the Scriptures, both that in the *Flesh*, and that in the *Spirit.*) But *three Comings* of Christ [not only that in the *Flesh at Jerusalem*, and that in *the Spirit*; but also another coming *in the Flesh*, yet to be expected] we do not read of. And indeed, how should he, if *G. Keith* says true, *Way cast up*, p. 131. that 'That Body 'which was crucified on the Cross at *Jerusalem*, and is 'now ascended and glorified in Heaven——*is no more a* 'Body of *Flesh*, *Blood*, *and Bones*, but a pure, ethereal, or 'heavenly Body. But that G. *Whitehead*'s words there, related to *such a Coming* of Christ in *an outward Body* of *outward Flesh*, visible to Carnal Eyes, therein to reign, as an *outward King*, after an *outward manner*, a thousand years *on Earth*, (which some Baptists call the *Personal Reign of Christ*) may be gather'd also from another Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, called *Christ Ascended*, written near the same time, in Answer to *John Newman*, a Baptist, where having in p. 22. treated of Christs coming, so as that 'his Appearance shall be *universally seen*, both to the 'Joy of the Righteous, and universal Conviction and 'Condemnation of the wicked, *&c.* he speaks, p. 23. of the disappointment of them, 'who are expecting that 'Christs *second Coming*, or Appearance to Salvation, will 'be a *Personal Coming*, and his Reign a *Personal Reign*, 'which word [*Personal*] they add to the Scripture; and 'do they not herein shew their Carnal Expectations, said he?

G. Keith has another Cavil in this page, (which also he had in p. 3. of his *Gross Error*) against *G. Whitehead* about 1 *Thes.* 4. 17. which he says, *G. Whitehead* denies to be meant of his *Personal Coming*. *G. Whitehead* then, it seems, did not deny it to be meant of *Christs Coming*, and of his Coming to *Judgment*; but that which he excepted against, was such a *Carnal sort of Personal Coming*, as the Baptists expected him to come in, and as is mentioned before. To shew the Baptists the folly of which, he asks them, from those words of the Apostle, both in the 15th and 17th Verses [*We which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord*] if *they did live and remain to a Personal Coming of Christ in the Clouds*, yea, or nay? Which *G. Keith sophistically* calls a *Sophism*, to wrest it to his inward Coming; Whereas *G. Whitehead* did not turn it to his *inward* Coming, nor did he use the word [*inward*] in that place at all. But he shewed by the Description *John* gave of him, when he saw him in the midst of the Seven Golden Candlesticks, that such an *outward* Coming as the Baptists looked for him in, in such a *Personal* Appearance as should be visible to the *carnal* Eye, was not suitable to him. But whereas *G. Keith* says, (both in his *gross Error*, p. 5. and here also) The Apostle's using the word *we*, there, [*we that remain*] is an *Enallage Personæ*, putting [*we*] for [*They*] like that of *James*, *Therewith bless* we *God*, *and therewith curse* we *Men*, *James* 3 9. Though he delivers it positively, and like a *Dictator*, yet I see not why he must needs be believed: Why might not the Apostle speak in the first Person, [*we*] as supposing that great and extraordinary Appearance and Coming of Christ (the certain time of which no Man knew, *Mat.* 24. 36.) was so near at hand, that it might *probably* fall out in his Life-time: For as the Apostles accounted the Times they lived in, the *Last Days*, or *Last Times*, and ordinarily called them so, (*Heb.* 1. 2. and 9. 26. 1 *Pet.* 1. 20. 1 *John* 2. 18.) so they thought the End of the World

World was *not far off*. What elſe made *Paul*, when he had told the *Corinthians*, That the things he had related were written for our Admonition, add, *Upon whom the Ends of the Word are come?* 1 Cor. 10. 11. Why elſe did *Peter* ſay, *The End of all things is at hand?* 1 Pet. 4. 7.

G. *Keith* concludes this Page with a moſt *horrible Falſhood* and *Slander* upon G. *Whitehead*, ſaying, *He has Allegorized away Chriſts Birth, his Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion, and Coming to Judgment.* This I ſay is a moſt *horrible Falſehood and Slander.* For though there is none of theſe that may not be allegorized, (and perhaps, none among the *Quakers* has allegorized them *ſo frequently* and *ſo far*, as G. *Keith* himſelf) yet has not G. *Whitehead* ſo allegorized any of them, as to *take away the Literal ſence* and meaning of them; but has owned and aſſerted the Truth and Benefit of them *according to the Letter* of the Scriptures.

In p. 40. He makes a Digreſſion to entertain his Company, thus, *I hope I have proved that I am not petulant, and that I have juſt cauſe to accuſe them of theſe Errors.* Then adds, *I was preſented by a Grand Jury at* Philadelphia, *and the Preſentment would have been proſecuted, if the Government had not been changed; and I had been accuſed for endeavouring to alter the Government, which is Capital by their Law; and they would have found me guilty of Death, had they not been turned out of the Government*, &c. Now though in this he does but deliver his own *Conjectures*, what *would have been* (which how *unlikely* they are, may be gathered from *what was*, ſeeing when he *was fined* for ſome *Evil Demeanor*, the Fine was *not exacted*, though there was time enough to have done it, before the Government was Changed) yet his telling his Hearers that he had *juſt cauſe* to accuſe the Quakers of Error, and then immediately acquainting them with his having been Preſented at *Philadelphia*, is a ſufficient *Indication*, that the

Ground of his *accuſing* the Quakers, is not *Zeal* for Religion, but *Malice* and *Revenge*.

In the ſame page he pretends to give another Proof againſt G. *Whitehead*, but he does indeed but repeat one of the Proofs he gave before upon his firſt Head, in p. 16. where I anſwer'd it at large. He takes it out of p. 29. of that Book called *The Nature of Chriſtianity*, to which himſelf writ the *Additional Poſtſcript*: And he gives it thus: Says G. *Whitehead* to *R. Gordon*, *Doſt thou look for Chriſt's coming again to appear outwardly in a Bodily Exiſtence? If thou doeſt, thou mayſt look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt ſee ſuch an Appearance of him.* See now the *Fraud* and *Falſeneſs* of this Man, who that he might make this Paſſage look towards the End for which he brought it, hath *corrupted* the place, by *leaving out* thoſe words that he knew would defeat his purpoſe: For whereas he gives the words thus, *Doſt thou look for Chriſt's coming again, to appear outwardly in a bodily Exiſtence? If thou doſt*, &c. The words in *G. Whitehead*'s Book, are thus, *Doeſt thou look for Chriſt*, as the Son of Mary, *to appear outwardly in a bodily Exiſtence*, to ſave thee, according to thy words, p. 30? *If thou doſt*, &c. It happened that one of the Auditors, being a Quaker, ſaid, *Let the paſſage be read out. G. Keith* to have put it by, ſaid, *If we had not had theſe Oppoſitions, we might have ſaved an hour.* Had he but now had an Auditor ready (as he had in p. 39.) to have ſaid, *He has done enough*, it had paſſed, and he had gone off ſo: But no body offering to help him out, he was fain to read the paſſage right, and ſo it is ſet down at the top of his p. 41. He had put in the words [*coming again*] and left out the words [*as the Son of Mary*] and the words [*to ſave thee*] upon which the ſtreſs of the paſſage lay, that ſo he might *make* himſelf a proof. And yet in p. 41. upon his offering to read another Paſſage, out of a Manuſcript Paper; he ſaid, *I am glad that my Neighbour has ſuch Charity for me, that he thinks I will not*

read

read wrong: (for it ſeems the Perſon he called his Neighbour, not ſuſpecting him guilty of ſo great *Baſeneſs*, had ſaid in another caſe, p. 24. *I think he does not read falſe*) And to beget the like Charity now, he added, *I ſhall forfeit the Name of an Honeſt Man, if I read one word different from the Original.* How differently from the Original he read this paſſage in p. 40. will appear by comparing it with the ſame Paſſage, as he was *fain at laſt* to read it, in p. 41. How far he has forfeited the Name of an Honeſt Man, (if he then had it to forfeit) I leave the Reader to judge.

Upon this Quotation, he ſays, p. 41. *Ye ſee theſe are plain and expreſs words againſt Chriſt's outward Coming.* But in making this Inference, he is doubly to Blame. For firſt, Here are no plain or *expreſs* words againſt Chriſts outward Coming,; neither doth the paſſage relate to his outward Coming it ſelf, but to the *End* of that coming, and to the *manner*, ſtate and quality, in which he ſhall then come. For the End of his coming then is not to *Save*, as if Salvation were not to be obtained, or known till then; neither will he come in that *low ſtate* of *Humiliation* and *form of a Servant*, wherein he appeared *as the Son of Mary* (tho' he was always more than *barely* the Son of Mary) for he ſhall come *in the glory of his Father*, Mat. 16. 27. Or as *Luke* expreſſes it, *In his own Glory, and in his Fathers, and of the Holy Angels*, Luke 9. 26. But ſecondly, *G. Keith* is the more to be blamed, for ſaying, of thoſe Words of *G. Whitehead*: *Here are plain and expreſs Words againſt Chriſt's outward Coming*, ſeeing he confeſſes in p. 40. That in another Book, called *The Real Quaker a Real Proteſtant*, *G. Whitehead* hath declared 'He did not mean it of Chriſts coming 'to Judgment'; but he meant it thus, Becauſe *R. Gordon* 'would needs have it, that Salvation was delayed till 'Chriſts outward Coming. Who, but a Man of a *moſt malicious* Mind, would urge another Mans words againſt

him, contrary to his own declared Sence and Meaning? *G. Keith* ſays, He is *apt to think G. Whitehead* abuſes *R. Gordon:* But every indifferent Reader will be apt to conclude, *beyond thinking*, that *G. Keith* has abuſed *G. Whitehead*, and that very groſly.

In p. 41. he has a little Flurt at me, which ſhews he wanted either Matter or Wit, that he would entertain ſo great an Aſſembly with ſuch a *Trifle*. He tells it that *I had ſaid, I had upward of ſix Manuſcripts. What, ſays* T. Eſſwood, *(in his way of Quibbling) ſix and an half?* His words were, *I produced above ſix Manuſcripts.* I knowing he loved a *looſe* way of expreſſing himſelf, and *ſhunn'd plainneſs* of Speech, in my Anſwer to the Matter for which he ſaid he produced thoſe Manuſcripts, as a *Nip* for his *conceited Folly*, asked in a Parentheſis, *What means he by above ſix? Does he mean ſix and a half? For if they had been ſeven or eight*, he might as well have ſaid ſo, as *above ſix.* This he calls my way of *Quibbling*; which I think was ſuitable enough to his way of *Scribbling.* Why ſhould ſuch a *conceited* Philoſopher *play the Fool*, and not be told of it?

He ſays, I tell him he is *guilty of Forgery, in ſaying the Yearly Meeting cenſured any Expreſſions in his Manuſcripts:* But becauſe he repeats this over and over in the following part of his Narrative, I ſay nothing to it here, intending to ſpeak to it once for all, when he is got paſt his Manuſcripts, which he now ſays are *ſeven* or *eight* (it ſeems he does not yet know *whether*; however it is *more than ſix and an half*, and not quite ſo uncertain as *above ſix.*) Yet I find not that he produced any more than two, and thoſe but *private Letters* from one Man, and out of them he read but a *piece of each*; and how truly and fairly he read thoſe Pieces, I know not, having no Copy to prove them thereby; for when they were read at the Yearly Meeting he mentions, *we could not obtain a Copy of them* from him; and we have ſeen but lately how unfair

and

and unjuſt he was, in giving a Paſſage out of *G. Whitehead*'s Book. The Letters he mentions go under the Name of one *John Humphreys*, and the ſubſtance of that part he read out of the firſt Letter, is, 1. *A blaming them that divide Chriſt, and put aſunder what God hath joyned together, by making ſuch a diſtinction between Chriſt within and Chriſt without, as divides Chriſts Body from his Spirit.* 2. *A cenſuring* G. Keith's *Ten Articles of Faith, as reliſhing too much of Carnality.* And then ſays, *I am grieved to hear ſome ſay, They did expect to be juſtified by that Blood that was ſhed at Jeruſalem.* When *G. Keith* had read what he thought would ſerve his purpoſe, he gave over, and ſaid, *I have not read the whole Letter, but an intire Paragraph of it.* And thereupon ſays, *So farewel Chriſt without; You divide Chriſt, if you mention Chriſt without.* I think he wrongs the Man in that Inference, for I take his meaning to be, (not that the *bare mentioning Chriſt without*, is a Dividing of Chriſt but) that *ſo to diſtinguiſh* between Chriſt within and Chriſt without, as to make *two diſtinct Chriſts of them*, (whereas Chriſt within and Chriſt without, is but one Chriſt) this is *to divide Chriſt*; and this I take to be that which *Jo. Humphreys* did there blame. But I would fain know, why *G. Keith* did not read *the whole Letter*: For (though I would not be over-confident upon my own Memory, of a thing I never heard read but *once*, and that more than two years ago, yet) I am ſtrongly perſwaded there were other Paſſages in that Letter which was read in the Yearly Meeting, that did explain *J. Humphreys* his meaning in theſe. And I cannot think why *G. Keith* (who is *prolix* enough at other times) ſhould *pick out a piece* of a Letter only, and conceal the reſt, if he had not found ſomething in the reſt, that he thought would take off the edge of his Objection againſt that he took. As for thoſe pieces of *J. Humphreys* Letters, which *G. Keith* hath expoſed in his *Narrative*, (though I do not hold my ſelf

(nor the People called Quakers) accountable for them, or for every thing that particular Persons may write in private Letters, yet) I charitably hope (though I know not the Man) that wherein he hath erred, it hath rather been in the Expression of his Mind, than in his real Intent and Meaning. For in that passage of his first Letter, wherein he says, *I am grieved to hear some say they did expect to be justified by that Blood that was shed at Jerusalem*, I take these words to depend upon that complaint which he had made before, of *Dividing Christ*, by that kind of Distinction which some had made, between *Christ within* and *Christ without*, whereby they attributed (at least he thought they did) that to *one part only*, as distinct and *divided from the other*, which ought in a right sence to be ascribed to both joyntly. I am the rather induced to believe this was his meaning, from that Passage which *G. Keith* hath given out of his second Letter, (which seems to have been written on this occasion) wherein he says the word [*Only*] should have been put in, and that the leaving it out, was *the Omission of his Pen*. Now had that word been in, (as it seems he intended it should have been) the Sentence would have been thus, *I am grieved to hear some say, They did expect to be justified by that Blood Only, that was shed at Jerusalem*; And then I suppose *G. Keith* would not have quarrelled with it. And though *J. Humphreys*, when he saw how his *Meaning was wrested* in his first Letter, did in his second *Letter*, (after he had declared the word [*Only*] should have been in, and that that was his meaning) in contempt of the deceitful and malicious workings of the Adversaries, seemed *indifferent* whether they put in the word [only] or no, saying, as G. Keith cites him, *But however, Let Deceit and Malice have its full force and scope upon it, and that word (only) taken off the Conclusion of my Paper*, &c. Yet it seems he did this, not as intending thereby to *exclude the Blood shed at Jerusalem* from having

ving any ſhare or part in our Juſtification; but as believing from his *before declared* Senſe, that Chriſt (and conſequently his Sacrifice) ought not to be *divided*, but *taken joyntly*; that it would appear his Words had the force and import of the Word [*only*] and that that was his Meaning, though the Word only was *through inadvertency* left out. And therefore he refers to the Words of Chriſt, *John* 6. 63. *Which ſaying*, ſays he, *of our Saviour himſelf, will clear me of your Aſperſion.*

So that (even from what *G. Keith* hath thought fit to give of his ſecond Letter) it appears, that their *wreſting* the Words in his former Letter, and inferring therefrom that he *wholly excluded the Blood ſhed at* Jeruſalem *from being concerned in our Juſtification*, he took to be *an Aſperſion upon him*, and ſo called it. Now the Words of our Saviour, which he referr'd to in *John* 6. 63. are theſe, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing.* In which Words it may not be ſuppoſed our Saviour meant that *his Fleſh* or Body, as it was *in Conjunction* with his Spirit and Soul, and contained that Divine Life which dwelt in it, and *was offered up together*, a compleat Sacrifice to the Father, did *profit nothing*, did avail *nothing*, did contribute *nothing* to the Benefit and Advantage of Man: But that the Fleſh or Body *conſidered ſimply of it ſelf and by it ſelf*, without that Divine Life, Soul and Spirit that was in it, *profited nothing*. So *Wilſon*, in his *Chriſtian Dictionary* (Sixth Edition, Printed at *London*, 1655.) expounds thoſe Words, 'The Fleſh profiteth nothing, that is to ſay, the Humane 'Nature of Chriſt is not profitable to us *of it ſelf*, but 'as the Godhead dwelleth in it, giving Life to it, and 'quickning us by it. And thus, he ſays, *Tindal* and the Bible Note expound this Place. In like manner I underſtand *John Humphreys*, both when he ſaid in his firſt Letter, 'I am grieved to hear ſome ſay, they did 'expect to be juſtified by that Blood that was ſhed at

'Je-

'*Jeruſalem*; and in his ſecond Letter (from thoſe Words of Chriſt, it is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing) 'So he himſelf aſcribed the 'Work of Man's Salvation, and Sanctification, not 'to the Fleſh that ſuffered, but to the Spirit that quick-'ned; not to the Blood that was ſhed at *Jeruſalem*, but 'unto the Fleſh and Blood that is ſpiritual, *&c.*) to in-'tend and mean, not the outward Fleſh and Blood *of it ſelf only*, without or *apart from* the Divine Life, Spirit and Power that appeared in it, and gave Virtue to it, but both together. Nor *Primarily* or *Principally* the *outward* Fleſh and Blood; but the *Divine Life*, Spirit and Power that dwelt in that outward Body, and made it what it was; if he meant otherwiſe, we cannot ſtand by him therein.

But whereas *G. Keith* ſays of *John Humphreys*, in *Nar.* p. 43. That *ſome of his own Fraternity perſwaded him to put in the Word, Only, and that would excuſe the Matter; he puts in the Word Only, and* (ſays *G. Keith*) *he thinks it was againſt his Conſcience, and ſo bids put it out again.* That ſome of his own *Fraternity* (as *G. Keith ſcoffingly* ſpeaks) perſwaded him to put in the Word, *Only*, *doth not appear to be true*; but that, when he had put it in, he thought it was againſt his Conſcience, *appears to be falſe:* And from thence it appears, that *G. Keith* did not think it was *againſt his Conſcience* to *belie him.* Where did *J. Humphreys* declare that the putting in the Word, Only, was againſt his Conſcience, and that therefore he bid put it out again? The Words of his Letter (as *G. Keith* has given them) ſhew the contrary.

His 43. p. is ſpent in a confuſed, rambling Diſcourſe, in which he *flits to and fro*, from one thing to another, in a looſe way, without ſticking to any thing. But in the Cloſe of it, he mentions a Teſtimony from *W. Penn*, to prove that Bodily Death did not come in

by

by Man's Sin: Which in p. 44. he gives out of *W. Penn*'s Book (in Answer to *Reeve* and *Muggleton*, called, *The New Witnesses proved Old Heretick*s, p. 55.) thus, *If the Flesh of Beasts is capable of dying, rotting and going to dust, who never sinned, why should not Man have died, and gone to Dust, though he had never sinned?* He should have noted that *W. Penn* spake this upon an *extravagant* Notion of theirs, That, 'The Reason why 'Men's Bodies in Death, or after Death, do rot, or 'stink, in the Grave, and come to Dust, is, because 'there was Sin in their Bodies whilst they lived; but 'on the contrary, if Men had no Sin in their Natures 'or Bodies, they might live and die, and naturally 'rise again, by their own Power, in their own Time. Upon this he thus observed, 'Why should Sin only 'cause the Body to rot, stink and go to Dust? Does 'not the Scripure, and *Reeve* himself (in his Book, 'p. 44.) give another Reason, namely, That what 'came from Dust, is that which must go to Dust? Then adds (to shew their weakness in assigning Sin only for the cause of the Bodies rotting and going to Dust) 'Besides, if the Flesh of Beasts is capable of Dying, Rotting and going to Dust, who never sinned, why should 'not Man have dyed, and gone to Dust, though he had 'never sinned? And in p. 5, 6. he attacks *Reeve* again, upon his own Assertion, saying, 'And it is further evident, That Sin is not the cause of Mens Bodies crumbling into Dust, from *Reeves* his own Words, *&c.* So that what *W. Penn* said, on that Subject, might be but *Argumentum ad Hominem*, which ought not to be turned upon himself, But if *W. Penn* had directly affirmed that Man's *Natural* Body, as it was *formed of the Dust of the Ground*, Gen. 2. 7. Should have *returned to Dust again*, although he had not sinned, would that have been a gross and vile Error contrary to the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith? Indeed, according

ding to *G. Keith*'s wild Notions of *Adam*'s and *Eve*'s Bodies (both before the Fall, while they *grew together back to back*, before they were *split asunder*, as he *Fables*, and after the Fall too) the Bodies which they had after the Fall, did derive from Sin, not only their *Mortality*, but their *beginning*, and the *Cause* of their *Being* made: For he *Dreams* that the Bodies in which they lived after the Fall, were not the *same* that they had before the Fall; but were those *Coats of Skins*, which God is said, *Gen.* 3. 21. to have made for them, which he fancies to be their *outward Bodies of Flesh, Blood and Bones*, and that those were made to cover the *nakedness* of their former Bodies. Of which, and many more such *Dotages*, the Reader (if he have any thing of a sober Brain) may soon read himself *Sick*, in his Book, called, *Truth Advanced*, more especially from p. 16. to p. 32.

In this 44. p. again He acknowledges *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* to be *Orthodox*, though he has charged them with being *Heterodox*, and for ought I see makes them *Heterodox* and *Orthodox* in the same things; which is pretty.

Before he got hither, he had *pretty well tired* his Auditors. He was fain, in p. 41. to say, *I beg of you; I shall be but short:* And so drill'd them on the Contents of three Pages further. Now, says he, *I beg your Patience* for one or two Quotations more, before I have done. (This was heavy, dull Work.) *It is*, says he, *out of* Tho. Ellwood, *to shew you that* T. Ellwood *Charges me with Forgery, because I said the Yearly Meeting did censure some of these Unsound Papers.* This he has been *harping at* divers times before, both in p. 41, 42, and 43. But I deferr'd my Answer to it, till I came hither. The ground of his Cavil here at me is this, He (to support his tottering Credit among those few that seemed at first willing to listen a little to him) had in his Book,

Book, called, *A ſeaſonable Information*, &c. p. 26. affirmed, *That the Paper, called, A true Account of the Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting in* 1694. (which his Agent *R. Hannay* publiſh't) *doth own them of the other ſide* (by whom, he meant, the Friends in *America* whom he had ſeparated from) *to be guilty of unſound and erroneous Doctrines.* I (in my Book, called, *A further Diſcovery*, written in Anſwer to that of his) ſaid, p. 84. 'How falſe and unfair he is in this, the Words 'of that Paper ſhall ſhew, which are theſe, *viz.* And 'although it appears, that ſome few Perſons have given 'Offence, either through erronious Doctrines, un-'ſound Expreſſions, or Weakneſs, Forwardneſs, want 'of Wiſdom and right Underſtanding, yet, *&c.* Upon this I then made this Obſervation (which he now repeats in his *Narrative*, p. 44.) 'Here ye ſee, Friends, 'that that Paper of the Yearly Meeting is ſo far from 'owning them of the other ſide, as he calls them (that 'is, the Friends in *America*) to be guilty of unſound 'and erronious Doctrines (which *G. Keith* here *ex-'preſly ſaith* it doth) that it doth not undertake to de-'termine, whether the Offence (ſaid to be given by 'ſome few Perſons) was through erronious Doctrines, 'and unſound Expreſſions, or through Weakneſs, For-'wardneſs, want of Wiſdom and right Underſtand-'ing. And yet this Man hath the *Confidence* and *Falſe-'neſs*, to ſay poſitively, that Paper doth own them 'guilty of *holding* unſound and erronious Doctrines. This is that for which he ſays, I charged him with *Forgery*. And if I did, *he well deſerved it*; for I proved it ſo plain upon him, that he has not had the Confidence ſo much as to attempt to acquit himſelf of it: And that, with many more ſuch groſs things, which I faſtened on him in that Book, were, I ſuppoſe, the reaon, why he has not hitherto replied to it, though it has been in Print well nigh theſe two Years. Now,

not

not being able to ſhake off the Forgery, he *turns Cat in Pan*, and endeavours to make ſome Advantage againſt me, for having denied that the Yearly Meeting had owned thoſe Friends in *America* to be guilty of erroneous Doctrines, alledging that thereby *I make both the Meeting and my ſelf to approve and juſtifie them.* But that is no *fair Conſequent.* I hope there were ſome, at leaſt, in his Auditory at *Turners* Hall, that were *more juſt* than to condemn us (ſo much as in their own Thoughts) whom he had Arraigned and ſo highly Charged *behind our backs*, (though he pretended to Convict us from our own Books) but would, *like wiſe and upright Men*, ſuſpend their Judgment, till they ſhould have heard or read our Defence? And if any that were there, fell ſhort of this *impartial Juſtice*, we value their Judgement no more than it deſerves. But if this is but *right* and *reaſonable* in this Caſe; how *unright* and *unreaſonable* would it have been in the Yearly Meeting, to have given forth, judicially and authoritatively, as a Yearly Meeting, a Judgment againſt any particular Perſon or Perſons, upon the *Accuſation* of a *declared Enemy*, without *due* Proof, and without *hearing the Parties Face to Face*, or at all hearing the *Defence* of the *Accuſed*; nay, when the Perſons accuſed were not only *not preſent*, nor in the Nation, but ſome thouſands (perhaps) of Miles diſtant, in another Quarter of the World! This was the Caſe of that Yearly Meeting, in 1694. *G. Keith* made a Clamour then againſt ſome in *America*, for holding (as he ſaid) groſs and vile Errors, as he has ſince done againſt ſome here; And he urged the reading of ſome Papers he had brought with him, relating to that Affair. Which though the Meeting was not obliged, in ſtrict Juſtice, to admit (the Accuſed not being preſent) yet to ſtop his preſent, and to have prevented (if it might have been) his future Clamour, the Meeting condeſcended, and he read (or cauſed to be read)

ſeveral

ſeveral Manuſcripts. But when they were read (beſides that divers of them appeared to be rather the haſty Products of Heat and Contention, which he had raiſed and kindled there, than the well-weighed Sentiments of a ſedate and deliberate Judgment) of what Authority could they be to the Meeting to ground a Judicial Sentence upon? Or who would be willing to have Judgment given againſt him, upon *no Evidence* but the *bare reading* of Letters (ſuppoſed to be his own) without having *Liberty to make his own Defence*, and to give his own Sence of any Expreſſion laid to his Charge? This is not new to *G. Keith*, for in my Book, called, *A further Diſcovery*, in Anſwer to his, called, *A ſeaſonable Information*, I debated this Caſe fairly with him. In p. 59. With reſpect to my ſelf, I told him (which I had alſo told him before, in another Book called, *An Epiſtle to Friends*, p. 41.) 'I obſerve he makes a 'great *Noiſe* and *Outcry* of groſs and vile Errors held 'by ſome, and them upheld by others, which he gives 'for one Reaſon or Cauſe of the Separation. But in'aſmuch as this is only his Charge, without due Proof, 'and the Perſons by him Charged with thoſe vile Er'rors, are not here preſent, to make Anſwer to his 'Charge, and defend themſelves, or to ſhew the *Occaſi'ons* that led to, and *Circumſtances* that attended thoſe 'Diſcourſes, from which he pickt the Words he Char'ges them with, and to *explain their meanings* therein, 'I have not thought it fit, or becoming me, *on no better 'Ground*, to meddle with thoſe Matters, being alike 'unwilling to juſtifie them, if in any thing they have 'done or ſaid amiſs, as to condemn them unheard, up'on the report of another, and him their profeſſed Ad'verſary.

In p. 65. (With reſpect to the Meeting's Words before cited) which he would have ſtrained to be a Judgment againſt the Friends in *America*, whom he had

had warred with) I told him, 'What offence was gi-
'ven, might as well be through Weakneſs, Forward-
'neſs, want of Wiſdom and right Underſtanding, as
'through erronious Doctrines, or unſound Expreſſions.
'Nay, if it were through unſound Expreſſions (though
'they are not to be excuſed, yet) that doth not prove
'a Man guilty of *holding groſs and vile Errors*, &c. For
'a Man that is *ſound in Judgment*, and Doctrine, may
'*chance to drop* an unſound Expreſſion, through weak-
'neſs, as ſome perhaps in *America*, through *G. Keith*'s
'*catching Queſtions*, may have been drawn to do, whoſe
'*Weakneſs* for him to expoſe in Print, in that aggrava-
'ting manner as he has done, to the Reproach of the
'whole Profeſſion, is very great Wickedneſs in him,
'and for which his Condemnation from God ſlumbers
'not. And in p. 66. with reſpect to his Manuſcripts,
(which he would have had paſs for ſufficient Proofs)
I told him thus. 'He being a *Party* is not a compe-
'tent *Judge* what is *ſufficient* Proof in this Caſe. That
'ſome *Manuſcripts* were read in the Yearly Meeting by
'him, or on his part, I remember; how many they
'they were, or whether ſigned by the Perſons own
'Hands, I know not. But, ſuppoſing (not granting)
'thoſe *Manuſcripts* to be either *Autographs*, or Authen-
'tick Copies, I believe he himſelf would think much,
'to be concluded or condemned from *Inferences*, or *Con-*
'*ſtructions* made upon *Manuſcripts* (eſpecially, if they
'be private Letters, as I think, ſome of thoſe he had
'read, were) without his being preſent, and having
'the Liberty to *open* and *explain* his *Senſe* and *Meaning*
'in any Paſſage, Word or Sentence in them. Thus had
I controverted this Point with him formerly, in that
Book of mine, called, *A further Diſcovery*, which he
has never replied to; which might have been enough
to have ſtopped him from telling that Story at *Turners-*
Hall, if he had not wanted Matter. And this I ſup-

poſe

poſe will be ſufficient to ſatisfie any impartial Reader: That the Yearly Meeting had no ſufficient Ground, from what *G. Keith* offered to them, to cenſure judicially thoſe Perſons in *America*, whom he exclaimed here againſt; conſequently that he has no juſt ground to Charge the Meeting (or me for defending the Meeting againſt his unjuſt Charge) with approving and juſtifying thoſe things which he calls vile Errors in them.

But he comes off *moſt lamely* in pretending that he was *charitable* to the Yearly Meeting, in conſtruing the *Disjunctive* [or] in their Words, to be equivalent to the *Copulative* [and] as, ſays he, ſometimes it is. Did he ever know *or* taken for *and*, in an Alternative Propoſition. or Sentence, as this was, by any that pretended to underſtand Words? Let him *bluſh at his Folly*, and *repent of his Hypocriſie*, in calling that *Charity*, which was indeed but a *deceitful Shift*. And let him learn to be *juſt*, before he pretends to be *Charitable*.

He *thruſt* upon his Auditors, one Quotation more, out of a Book of mine, which he almoſt promiſed them, ſhould be the laſt, at leaſt of Printed ones. He tells them, *That I blame him, for comparing the Books of Freinds, to the Books of the Greek and Latin Fathers.* which in p. 45. he gives out of p. 99. of my *Further Diſcovery*, thus, *In comparing the Books of Friends, to the Books of them called the Greek and Latin Fathers, he has not done as a Friend and Brother, but as an Enemy, in ſuppoſing Friends Books to have been written by no better Guidance, nor clearer ſight, than theirs, who lived and writ in thoſe Dark times.* Upon this he ſaid, *You ſee how modeſt they are here?* And upon that he makes his Auditors give a *ſhout, Signifying*, ſays he, *their diſlike that the Quakers Books ſhould be preferr'd ſo far to the Greek and Latin Fathers, next to the Days of the Apoſtles.* One might wonder here, at the Cauſe of his Auditors *ſhouting:* For

ſuch of them, as could underſtand what was meant by Greek and Latin Fathers, one might expect ſhould be men of greater *Wiſdom* and *Gravity*, than to *ſhout* in ſuch Aſſemblies; And for the *undiſcerning Mob*, it was a Subject ſo much above their Capacity and Pretences, that it cannot be ſuppoſed they ſhould *ſhout* at that, if they had not been excited thereunto, by ſome little *antick Geſticulation* from him. But to the matter. They ſhouted, he ſays, Signifying their diſlike, that the Quakers Books ſhould be preferred ſo far to the Greek and Latin Fathers, next to the Days of the Apoſtles. *Why next to the Days of the Apoſtles?* Theſe were not my words. I did not refer to the times *next to the Days of the Apoſtles.* But my words were,—Who lived and writ in *thoſe Dark times.* Muſt thoſe Dark times, needs be next *to the Days of the Apoſtles*? See what an *Unfair Stretch* this was. Were not moſt, and the moſt noted, of them, in the *fourth* and *fifth* Centuries, three or four hundred Years or more, after the Apoſtles Days, as *Athanaſius*, *Baſilius*, the two *Gregories* (*Nazianſen* and *Nyſen*,) *Cyril*, *Ambroſe*, *Epiphanius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Hieronimus*, *Auguſtin*, *Hilarius*, and ſo on to *Gregory* the great, Pope of *Rome*. Nay, are not *Occumenius*, *Theophilact*, and *Bernard* (none of the worſt) reckoned amongſt the Fathers, though the firſt of them lived above eight hundred Years, the ſecond above a thouſand, and the laſt above eleven hundred Years after Chriſt? And why then muſt what I ſpake of thoſe who lived and writ in thoſe Dark times, be applied to them that lived next to the Days of the Apoſtles? Could he find no other times to be accounted Dark, but the Days next to the Apoſtles? He has ſhewed his good Will; and that he is no *Changling* in this reſpect (how great ſoever in another) but is always for perverting, and taking words in the worſt ſenſe.

That

That the times were Dark in the *4th* and *5th* Centuties, I ſuppoſe he will grant, when I ſhall have put him in mind, that much of the *Superſtition*, and not a little of *Corruption in Doctrine*, now retained in the Church of *Rome*, crept in in thoſe times (of which, were this a ſuitable place, I could give plenty of Inſtances) nor was the third *Secle* ſo clear, but that *Tertullian* (who lived in the very beginning of it) and *Origen* (about the middle of it) gave ſufficient Occaſion in their writings, for others to ſee, they were *too much* in the Dark. *Perkins* in his *Problem of the Church of* Rome, p. 12. tells us, that *Hierom* ſays, *Tertullian* was not *a man of the Church, becauſe he fell a way, to the Opinion of* Montanus. *Yea, that he was a chief Heretick.* He gives a *Catalogue* of the Books, *Tertullian* wrote *againſt the Orthodox*, and ſays, Gelaſius *adjudged all his Books to be Apocryphal.*

Origen, *Perkins* ſays, was *Errorum plenus*, Full of Errors; And that *Hierom* called his Writings *Venemous.* Of *Cyprian*, he ſays, p. 13. *While he too much admires* Tertullian, *he ſometimes favours the* Montaniſts. Alſtedius in *Lex.* Theol, p. 11. Blames *Hierom*, *Auguſtine Ambroſe*, *Hillary* and *Origen*, altogether, for their *abſurd Allegories*; Nay he taxes *Ambroſe* and *Hillary* with *ſome Contradictions.* And in p. 17. he ſays, *St.* Hierom *is ridiculous in Allegories over and over.* And *Auguſtin*, he ſays, *does ſometimes after the ſame manner.* Jurieu a French Proteſtant, in his late Book called *The Accompliſhment of the Prophecies*, Second Edit. Part, 1. and p. 217. ſays, St. *Baſil*, St. *Ambroſe*, and the two *Gregories*, *are the moſt antient Authors, in whom we begin to find the Worſhip and Invocation of Creatures.* And in Part, 2. p. 43, he ſays, St. Baſil *in the Eaſt*, and St. Ambroſe *in the Weſt*, *are the moſt Antient Fathers, in whom we find the Footſteps of the Invocation and Interceſſion of the Saints.* In Part 1. p. 270. he ſays, *The Antients did Copy one a-*

rather, almost without any Judgment, and always without Consideration. And he concludes, Part, 1 p. 112. *If the Authority of the Fathers, be not good in many Places, 'tis good in none, 'tis doubtful every where.* I give but these few Touches Concerning those Fathers (as they are called) who lived (not next to, yet) not many Ages after the Apostles Days. They who have a mind to know more on this Subject, may find enough (if not too much) in the learned *Dalleus.*

But that it may appear, I spake not by *rote*, in calling those times *Dark*, wherein most of those called Fathers before mentioned lived, I think fit to let the Reader understand, from *Perkins*'s *Problem* before cited, That *Praying for the Dead* (which is a peculiar Doctrine of Popery) is as Old as *Tertullians* time, about the latter End of the Second, and beginning of the Third Century, p. 97. And the Conceit of *Purgatory*, must to be sure, be some what Older. *Perkins* makes the Montanists *Authors of it*, p. 99. And *Tertullian* and *Origen the Chief*, p. 175. The Honouring of the *Relick* of the *Dead* came in a little after the Year 300. p 81. Praying to *Saints*, about the Year 380. p. 90. *The Celibacy*, or Single Life of Priests, between the Years 300. and 400. p 190, 191, 192. *Monkery*, about the Year 260. p. 226. And for *Superstitious Ceremonies* used in the Church of *Rome*, if *Genebrard*, *Fasciculus Temporum*, *Polidore*, *de invent Rerum*, and other *Writers* may be believed, the greatest part of them were introduced before the *Sixth* Century, and not a few in the *Third.*

In p. 46. he *obtrudes* upon his Auditory, the Copy of a Paper, which he pretends to have Received from some of the *Church-Party* (as he calls them) by which I confess at the first sight, I thought he had meant some *Episcopal Men*, till Reading on, I found he described them to be some that go among the Quakers. Why

he

he Denominates them, ſome of the *Church-Party*, (or of a Party for the Church) I know not, unleſs to *diſtinguiſh* them from himſelf, and ſuch as he was in hopes to get to him, to make a Party againſt the Church. However, he ſays, They were ſuch as *favoured him*; and (if he ſay true) it appears they favoured him, *more than Truth*, otherwiſe they would not have gone out of *the way of Truth, and common Juſtice*, to gratify him. For he ſays, *They gave him a Meeting* (There were, he thinks, Nine or Ten of them;) *They took notice*, he ſays, *of ſome of* Ellwood's *Forgeries and Abuſes*; And it ſeems they drew up a Paper againſt me, as a Cenſure and Judgment upon my Book, for he ſays, *They ſaid in their Paper*, T. Ellwood *had done him wrong*. And yet all this (if ever it was done) was *done in the Dark*, and in Hugger Mugger (as the ſaying is) without ever convening me, or acquainting me with it, before or after; nor did I ever hear of it, till now. He ſays, *Some of them are Eminent*, and that they are *Generally in good Repute among us*. If they were ſo, it would have added *ſome Repute to his Cauſe*, to have named them; but that, I obſerve, he would not be drawn to, by all the *Importunity* that was uſed. His Narrative gives Account that *H. G.* ſaid, *Let us know their names, who they are*; which he refuſing to tell, the other ſaid, *I dare thee to name their names*, or elſe thou art a Lyar, an Impoſtor, a Cheat; adding, *I dare ſay it is a Cheat*. All this would not prevail with *G. Keith* to name a Man of them: And yet he ſays, *Some of them have, I hope, that Courage, that I believe they would not be offended nor afraid, if I named them*. This makes me the more ſuſpect his Story to be falſe. And though I will not ſay poſitively, It is a Cheat; yet I dare ſay, *It looks as like a Cheat*, as any thing can well look. And I think an *Impartial* and *Judicious* Auditory would have required their names, and been better ſatisfied of the Authority of that Paper, before they

would have *lent him their Ears* to the Hearing of it. But, as if he had been *feeding Jackdaws*, all went down (for ought I find) that he offered, without the leaſt *chewing*, or Examination.

Now if there be any thing of *reality* in the *Story* he has told (of ſome Perſons whom he will not name, that gave him that Paper, of which he read the Copy in his Meeting at *Turner's-Hall*) and that it be not a *meer Fiction* of his own, to bring forth that as the work of others, which (for the weakneſs of it,) he might well have been aſhamed to have brought forth as his own; what ever might be their intent in doing it, (as perhaps to *ſtill and quiet him*, by making ſome *little ſhew of blaming me*, which ſuppoſing the Story true in Fact, is the moſt *Charitable Conſtruction* I can put upon it.) Yet I plainly ſee his deſign in publiſhing it is, *to ſlip his Neck out of the Collar*, (as they ſay) and thereby excuſe himſelf (if he might) *from Anſwering that Book of mine* (called *A further Diſcovery*) out of which the *Cavils* contained in the Paper he read, were pickt up. For he ſays, in a *Marginal Note* to p. 50. (both of that Book, and the t'other called *Truth Defended*) *I think I have effectually anſwered them here, as to the main.* Now I think it fit to give the Reader an Account, That that Book of mine, called *A further Diſcovery*, &c. and was an Anſwer to a Book of *G. Keith's* called *A Seaſonable Information, and Caveat*, &c. (the Epiſtle to which was Publiſhed firſt by it ſelf, about a Month before the Book) in which he charged me with *Fifty Falſe Accuſations, Perverſions* and *Forgeries* (which he pretended to have gathered up, out of a Former Treatiſe of mine, called *An Epiſtle to Friends*) and undertook, in ſo Many diſtinct Sections, to prove againſt me. All which in my *Further Diſcovery*, I Anſwered, and fully too, and *returned the Charge* of Falſe Accuſations, Perverſions and Forgeries upon him. This has lain upon him now near two Years, with-

without ſo much as attempting to Anſwer it. Now he would *ſham* me off with an *Idle Story* (*if not a meer Fable*) of what ſome few Perſons (that muſt not be named, that they may not be blamed and ſhamed) have in a Blind and *Indirect* manner, ſignified to him, as their Judgment Concerning ſome few (and *little material*) Paſſages in that Book of mine. And *this he would have paſs for an Anſwer to that Book.* Which that it may not, but that that Book (as well as the other, called *Truth Defended*) may ſtill remain upon him, as unanſwered; I will go throngh the ſeveral particnlars of it (which he for want of weight in himſelf, calls weighty) and ſhew both the *emptineſs* and *weakneſs of them*, and the *Folly* and *Falſhood* of his *Comments* upon them.

The Firſt Head is, that I blame *G. Keith* for miſtating the Controverſie (about the ſufficiency of the Light) and cunningly ſliding in the Word [*Within*] when he knew it was not in the *Words charged*, nor in the *Words proved:* To this it is oppoſed, in that Paper thus, *A true Copy of the three Judgments*, p. 6. *are theſe Words: All which are ſomething elſe than the People called Quakers underſtand by the Light, to wit, the Light in every Man's Conſcience, which* G. Keith *alledgeth, is Proof that* G. Keith *intended the Light within.* To this I ſay, 1. What is meant by *A true Copy of the three Judgments*, I know not. If it be a Book (as, by quoting, p. 6. it ſeems to be) I do not remember I have ever ſeen it; nor is it much material, to this buſineſs; whether I ever do or not. 2. Here's a *Relative* without an *Antecedent*, all *which* are ſomething elſe, *&c.* All *which?* all *what? All nothing at all:* For there is nothing mentioned, or recited out of that *True Copy*, to which the Relative *Which* may be referr'd. So that this is a *Nonſenſical Paſſage.* And, to compleat the *Folly* of this *weighty Particular*, as he calls it, the *Concluſion* of it is thus, *Which* G. Keith *alledgeth, is Proof that* G. Keith *intended the*

Ligh within. Here *G. Keith*'s pretended Advocates, inſtead of ſhewing that the Word *Within* was in the *Words charged*, or in the *Words proved* (which they ſhould have done; if they would have convicted me of miſcharging him, in ſaying he had cunningly ſlid in the Word, *Within*) come no nearer the Matter than to ſay, that ſomething or other (not naming what) *G. Keith alledgeth, is Proof that* G. Keith *intended the Light within.* They don't adventure ſo far as to ſay, that that ſomething (or All which, whatever it was) *is a Proof*, but that *G. Keith alledgeth it is a Proof.* And a Proof *of what*, I Pray? Why, a Proof that *G. Keith* **intended** the Light *within.* But is not that a fair Proof, at leaſt by *Implication*, that *G. Keith* did **not expreſs** the Word *Within* (whatever he *intended*) and conſequently, that I ſaid true, in ſaying, He knew it was *not in the Words charged, nor in the Words proved* (for how ſhould it, when it was *not in the Words ſpoken*, as is here implicitely acknowledged) but only in his Intention? Was *G. Keith ſo dull*, he could not ſee, that this was ſo far from being a Defence for him, that it wholly makes againſt him, and for me? To peice out this, there is added in his Paper, a Paſſage in one *Ben. Chamber*'s Letter: Another Paſſage in *John Delaval*'s Letter. And then is added, *John Humphrey*'s *two Letters read, and both to the ſame Purpoſe.* It may be ſo: And yet all to *little* or *no* purpoſe. For what were all theſe Letters, I pray? Were they made *publick* in Print? Or only *private Letters lying* in *G. Keith*'s Pocket? How then could it be expected I ſhould know, or take notice, what was in them? But I can aſſure *G. Keith* (and his Advocates too, if he hath any) that I went upon *ſurer* Ground than the Letters in his Pocket could be to me: For when I ſaid, He knows the Word *Within* was *not* in the Words *charged*, nor in the Words *proved*, I had *G. Keith himſelf for my Author*; and I thought

I could not *have a better*, againſt himſelf, *than himſelf*. He, in his *Seaſonable Information* (to which I then anſwered) ſpeaking of *T. Fitz-water*'s Charge againſt him, p. 12. ſaid, *His Charge was, That I denied the ſufficiency of the Light*. Here's not the Word *VVithin*; and therefore he knew (if he knew what he writ) that the Word *VVithin* was *not* in the Words *Charged*. Then three Lines lower, in the ſame Page, ſpeaking of what the Witneſſes proved, he ſays, *They proved againſt me, That I did not believe the Light was ſufficient without ſomething elſe*. Here's not the Word *VVithin*; and therefore he knew (if he knew what he writ) that the Word *VVithin* was *not* in the Words *proved*. This, I think were enough, on this Head, to clear me. But to manifeſt more fully, that I had good ground to ſay as I did, *viz.* that he knew the Word *VVithin* was not in the Words charged, I add, that in the ſame Book, p. 17. he ſays, 'I ſtand recorded on the Monthly Meeting Book at *Philadelphia*, by the Monthly Meetings 'Judgment given out againſt me, and clearing *T.* '*Fitz-water* for his accuſing me, that *I denyed the ſufficiency of the Light*; and the Evidence (ſays he) againſt 'me was, That I ſaid, *I did not believe the Light was ſufficient without ſomething elſe*. Here he has ſet down the *VVords charged*, and the *VVords proved*, as they ſtand recorded (if he may be believed) on the Monthly Meeting Book at *Philadelphia*, and yet here is not the Word *VVithin*, either in the *VVords charged*, or in the *VVords proved*. And this both he, and his pretended Advocates, might have ſeen in my *Further Diſcovery*, p. 62. Yet further in his Book, called, *Reaſons and Cauſes*, p. 8. where he gives this Matter as the *firſt Cauſe* of the *Separation*, he ſets down *T. Fitzwater*'s Charge againſt him thus. 'T — having openly in the Face of the 'Meeting accuſed *G. Keith*, *for denying the ſufficiency of* 'the *Light*. Here is *not the VVord VVithin*. And lower

in

in the ſame Page, telling what others witneſſed for him, he ſays they ſaid, 'They heard him both then and 'at all occaſions, that he delivered his Mind on that 'ſubject, always bear Teſtimony to the *ſufficiency of the* 'Light to Salvation. Here's *not the VVord VVithin.* And this I noted formerly, in my *Further Diſcovery*, p. 63. whom would *G. Keith* have me to believe, if not himſelf? Yet *G. Keith* has the Face, in his Comment upon this Head, *Nar.* p. 48. to ſay, *The Queſtion was not concerning the Light indefinitely; but the Light within*: And that I *accuſe him unjuſtly.*

The Second Head of that Paper is, That, in my *Further Diſcovery*, p. 101. are theſe Words, *And this makes a Verbal Confeſſion; yea, a bare verbal Confeſſion, ſufficient to Yoak them, as he phraſes it, together in Church-Fellowſhip.* To this they oppoſe, *Reaſons and Cauſes of the Separation*, p. 22. *ad finem*; Tho. Ellwood *leaves this out*, viz. *Touching theſe neceſſary and Fundamental Principles of Chriſtian Doctrine, as well as that their Converſation is ſuch as becomes the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* They add alſo another Sentence out of *Reaſons and Cauſes*, p. 36. But as this laſt Sentence relates not to thoſe Words of mine, which were expreſly reſtrained to the Quotation there given out of *Reaſons and Cauſes*, p. 22. So they (or he for them, for that it is his Work, whoever he got to Patronize it, I don't doubt) leave out the former part of my Words, which explain the latter. The Diſpute between him and me there, was not about Converſation, or how far, he either admitted, or required, that, as a Term of Communion with him; but it was about a *verbal Confeſſion* of Faith or Principles, as a *Door of Admittance* into Society or Fellowſhip, or *Terms of Communion* therein; See my Epiſtle, p. 59, 60, and 61. In his Anſwer to which (called *A Seaſonable Information*) p. 34. *Sect.* 37, 38. He mentioned not a Word of Converſation; but excepted againſt the

the Words *Door of Admittance*, and ſaid, he *made not a verbal Confeſſion, the Terms at all of Church-Communion, when the Profeſſion is but barely verbal; but when the Confeſſion or Profeſſion, floweth from the living Faith of Chriſt*, &c. To this I replying, in my *Further Diſcovery*, p. 101. ſhewed, that he had not *guarded* his Expreſſion, about a verbal Confeſſion, ſo before, in the Place I had quoted of his, which was that in *Reaſons and Cauſes*, p. 22. Then reciting the Words again, *viz. We are convinced and perſwaded in our Conſciences, that God calleth us to ſeparate from ſuch Unbelievers, and not to be yoaked together in Church-Fellowſhip and Diſcipline with any that we have not proof of by Confeſſion of the Mouth, that they are ſound in Faith*; I thereupon made this twofold Inference, '*So that he makes a verbal Confeſſion, a Proof of* 'their being ſound in the Faith, *and this makes a Verbal* 'Confeſſion, *yea, a bare verbal Confeſſion, ſufficient to yoak* 'them (*as he phraſes it*) *together in Church-Fellowſhip.* Now the leaving out the *firſt Part* of my Words, is injurious to the Senſe of the *Latter*: For it makes as if the *latter* Part (*viz.* That he makes abare verbal Confeſſion ſufficient to Yoak them together in Church-Fellowſhip) had been an *Aſſertion* of mine; whereas it is but *an Inference from the former*, and that former an *Inference from his Words* there quoted. For I did not *affirm* he makes a bare verbal Confeſſion ſufficient to Yoak them, *&c.* But from his ſaying, we are convinced, *&c.* that God calleth us to ſeparate, *&c.* and not to be yoaked in Church-Fellowſhip, *&c.* with any that *we have not proof of by Confeſſion of the Mouth, that they are found in Faith*; I inferr'd, 1. That he made a *verbal Confeſſion, a proof of their being found in the Faith*: And, 2. *That his doing ſo* (his making a Verbal Confeſſion a Proof of their being found in the Faith) *makes a verbal Confeſſion, yea, a bare verbal Confeſſion, ſufficient to yoak in Church-Fellowſhip.* Now in this I do not apprehend, I

did

did him any wrong at all, either in the *Inferences*, or in *ending the Quotation where I did*, and not giving the Words now added in the Paper [Touching these necessary and fundamental Principles (it should have been, *Parts*) of Christian Doctrine, as well as that their *Conversation* is such as becomes the Gospel, *&c.*] For the necessary Parts of Christian Doctrine are *comprehended* in the Words, *sound in Faith*; and *Conversation* was not in the *Terms* of the Debate, and therefore not proper to have been there put in. *G. Keith*'s *Clamour* therefore, in *Nar.* p. 48. is *groundless*, where he says, *I take notice how they* (the supposed Authors of his Paper) *notifie his Forgery, what he leaves out my Words.* This may be rather called *his* Forgery; For the Paper he read, *says nothing of Forgery*; but only mentions what Words I left out, without *passing any Censure*, or making any Observation upon it.

The Third Head of that Paper is, That in *Page* 103. T. Ellwood *accuseth* G. Keith *for giving of false Quotation, or forging Quotation* (this is the *Scotch Dialect*, by which I guess who framed it) out of *R. Barclay*'s Book. Then it says, *G. Keith*'s *Quotation compared with* R. Barclay's *agrees, as quoted*, Reasons and Causes, *&c.* p. 16. *For Substance of Doctrine*, p. 24, 25, 26. *in express Words*, and adds, p. 106. *T. Ellwood admits of Substance.* In the Margin is set, Let the Quotations be read out of *R. Barclay*'s *Anar*, Now whereas *G. Keith*'s pretended Advocates, or Compurgators, say here, that *G. Keith*'s Quotation compared with *R. Barclay*'s agrees as quoted, *Reasons and Causes*, p. 16. for Substance of Doctrine; I deny it, and that upon good ground, having now again examined the one with the other. And I put both *G. Keith* and all his Advocates upon it, to make it appear, if they can. The mentioning the Quotations *G. Keith* gave in p. 24, 25, 26. of *Reasons and Causes*, out of *R. Barclay* is nothing to the

the purpose (if they do agree) because it was not in those Pages that I charged him with false quoting. But in my Epistle First, I taxed him with wronging *R. Barclay* in the Words he gave; in his *Causeless Ground*, p. 8. as the express Doctrine and Testimony of *R. Barclay* in his *Anarchy*, p. 48. and I shewed it, and plainly proved it by comparing the places together: And in p. 61, 62. of that *Epistle*, I shewed a like abuse he had put upon *R. Barclay* and his Reader, in his *Reasons and Causes*, p. 16. in giving that Passage as *R. Barclay*'s Doctrine in *Anarchy*, p. 32, 33, 48, 49. which was neither his Words nor his Doctrine: And though he would have shuffled this off, in his *Seasonable Information*, p. 34, 35. Yet I would not suffer him so to do; but in my *Further Discovery*, p. 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106. drove him out of all his *Holes* and *Subterfuges* about it, and fixed it as a *false* Quotation on him; which neither he has cleared himself, nor his Advocates have acquitted him of, nor can. Whereas they say *T. Ellwood admits of Substance*; they speak not plainly. If they mean, that in p. 106. (which they mention) I admit *G. Keith* to have given the Substance of *R. Barclay*'s Doctrine, in that Quotation, *Reasons and Causes*, p. 16. which I taxed him for, *I deny it.* I only say there, 'He hath not attempted to prove, that this 'is the Doctrine, *or Substance of the Doctrine* of *R. Bar-* 'clay in that Book, by producing now *R. Barclay*'s own 'Words to manifest it.' This is not admitting *G. Keith*'s Quotation to be the *Substance* of *R. Barclay*'s Doctrine there. But to remove this conceit wholly, I said in the Page but just before, *viz.* p. 105. 'Ye see now, 'G. Keith not only confesses they are *not his VVords*, but 'dares not adventure to say, they are *plainly* and *di-* 'rectly his Doctrine; but the *Substance* of his Doctrine. 'And yet (said I) *even that I deny.* I say they are 'neither *R. Barclay*'s *VVords*, nor *Doctrine*, *nor the Sub-*

'stance

'ſtance of his Doctrine. What now may we ſuppoſe to be meant by thoſe Words in the Paper, *T. Ellwood admits of Subſtance?* Why, if we may Credit *G. Keith* in his *Commentary* upon it, *Nar.* p. 48. He ſays, *Theſe Men take notice that* T. Ellwood *is unfair in taking that Liberty to himſelf, he will not allow to me*: *They* (adds he) *obſerve, he admits of Subſtance of Doctrine in his own Citations, but will not allow it to me.* Whence will he pretend to have this? The Paper he read, and has Printed, ſays *nothing of it, nothing towards it, nothing like it.* This therefore I charge upon him, as a plain downright *Falſhood* and *Forgery.*

The fourth Head of that Paper is, That in *Further Diſcovery*, p. 19. T. Ellwood *accuſes* G. Keith, *that he blames Friends, that they were gone too much from the Outward to the Inward. But* G. Keith, p. 20. (it ſhould be p. 10.) *which* T. Ellwood *brings for Proof*, ſays, *That he blames ſome Perſons, for not rightly and fully preaching Chriſt without. So that* T. Ellwood's *Conſequences ſeems not fair, but ſtrain'd.* This is *weakneſs*, at leaſt. I ſhewed in that page, that the word [*too much*] there, related to their going *from the Outward*, which I proved he blamed Friends for, by his own ſaying *Seaſ. Inform.* p. 10. *I have blamed ſome Perſons for not rightly and fully Preaching* Chriſt *without.* Now if, according to him, they did not Preach Chriſt *without*, *rightly* nor *fully*, then, according to him they were gone too much *from the Outward*: And ſo my Conſequence was *not Strain'd*, but fair.

The fifth Head, ſays p. 22. T. Ellwood *accuſeth* G. Keith, *of a Fallacy, in declaring, he refuſed not to go forth at the Yearly Meeting: which Fallacy alledged, was, that* G. Keith *ſhould refuſe to go out ſome one Day of the Yearly Meeting. But that not appearing to us, by any Quotation, the ſuppoſed Fallacy appears not.* Well, What then? Whether it appear'd to them or not, the *Fallacy* is nevertheleſs

vertheleſs *certain*; And though I could not give a Quotation to prove it (having only his Books to quote out of) Yet I writ it not upon *ſurmiſe*, but upon *Sufficient Ground*, and *G. Keith* ſo well knows it to be true, that he has not had the boldneſs to deny it. There is another part of this Head, which ſays, *And further, Whereas* T. Ellwood *alledges that he was led into this miſtake by* G. Keith's *obſcure way of writing*; *for altho'* *in* p. 14. *nor* 18. *of the Book*, Reaſons *and* Cauſes, *as* T. Ellwood *unduly Argueth, yet in* p. 3. *Plea of the Innocent, quoted by himſelf*, p. 19. *of his firſt Book called* An Epiſtle, *&c. We find* G. Keith *gives account, the Yearly Meeting at* Philadelphia, *was in the firſt week of the 7th Month*, 1691. This looks like *G. Keith*'s work, both by the *Imperfectneſs of the Senſe*, and the diſpoſing of the words ſo, that the *Fallacy* I had charged him with, might paſs for a *Miſtake of mine*. Whereas the *Fallacy* I charged him with, was, His ſaying he did go out at the Yearly Meeting (to contradict my ſaying, he refuſed to go out at the Yearly Meeting) whereas (there being *ſeveral* Meetings in that time of the Yearly Meeting, he did go out at *ſome*, or *one*, of them, *but refuſed to go out at the reſt*. But the Miſtake that I was led into, by his obſcure way of writing, was, that the place of his Book which I then quoted, to prove he refuſed to go out of the Yearly Meeting (which was p. 14. Of *Reaſons and Cauſes*) ſpake not of the Yearly Meeting, but another, (as I remember, the *Quarterly*) *Meeting* (For that he did refuſe to go out at *two* ſeveral Meetings, that Book of his confeſſes, p. 14. and p. 18) I complained, that I was led into that Miſtake, by his obſcure way of writing, in not ſetting down the times wherein thoſe Meetings were held, and ſhewed that in thoſe pages of that Book of his, wherein thoſe Meetings were ſpoken of, there is neither Day, Month, nor Year ſet, wherein either the Quartely or Yearly Meeting was held. They

blame

blame me, for blaming him for his obſcurity, and ſay, though it was not in p. 14. nor 18. (nor indeed any where) of that Book, yet it was in p. 3. of another Book; and ſo it may be in p. 13. of another Book beſide that, for ought I know: But it was not at all, in that Book which I mentioned, where the Matter was treated of, and where it ought to have been. *G. Keith* upon this, *Rants at an high rate*, Nar. p. 49. and ſays, *You ſee, he argues like a rare Logician. He ſays, I don't name the Year nor Day, nor is it in* p. 14. *nor* p. 18. *But what then? I do it in another page*, ſays he. Ay, ſo he did indeed: But that *other* page, was in *another* Book. This *is rare Logick*, ſays he. And this is *rarer Juggling*, ſay I; to ſet down his *Matter* in one Book, and the *time of it* in another Book, that he might *hide* himſelf, *puzzle* his Reader, and *trepan* his Opponent. How could he, or his Advocates either, expect that I ſhould have recourſe to his *Plea of the Innocent*, to find the date of a Meeting treated of in his *Reaſons and Cauſes?* Oh, ſays G. Keith, *he has quoted that for another purpoſe.* True, but as it was for another *purpoſe*, ſo it was in *another Book*, written at *another time*, not in that wherein I complained of his Omiſſions; but in the Epiſtle written *three Months before.*

The ſixth Head is almoſt *ſuch another Cavil*, depending upon the uncertain Dates of ſome of their Meetings in *Penſilvania*, wherein their Controverſies had been handled. *G. Keith* had complained, that the Yearly Meeting there, had not given a right Judgment againſt *W. Stockdale*; I ſhewed that they had. He thereupon asks, *Why did they contradict the Sound Judgment of a Monthly Meeting at* Philadelphia, *paſſing due Cenſure upon* W. S. *ſix Months thereafter?* I took (and yet take) the Monthly Meeting he ſpeaks of, to have been held *ſix Months after* that Yearly Meeting; and thereupon askt him, how the Judgment of the *Firſt* could be

ſaid

ſaid to contradict that of the *Latter*, ſeeing the *Latter was not in being, when the Firſt was given?* To this he ſays, Nar. p. 49. *Pray, May not a Meeting held ſix Months after, Contradict a Meeting going before? I am charged* (ſay he) *that I cannot Speak Senſe: And why? Becauſe he* (T. Ellwood) *feigns that I ſaid, a Meeting ſix Months before Contradicted a Meeting held ſix Months after it; when there is no ſuch thing* (ſays he;) *But that a Meeting ſix Months after, Contradicts a Meeting ſix Months before.* Thus *G. Keith.* But how *falſly* ſhall quickly be made appear, and that both by *G. Keith* himſelf, and his Advocates. I ask therefore, Which of the two Meetings, the *Yearly* or the *Monthly*, did Contradict the other? Which of them was it, that was Contradicted by the other? *G. Keith* reſolves this plainly, in his *Seaſonable Information* p. 11. by ſaying, Why did *they*, (*viz.* the *Yearly* Meeting) *Contradict* the ſound Judgment of a *Monthly* Meeting at *Philadelphia*, paſſing due Cenſure upon *W. Stockdale ſix Months thereafter?* This is enough to ſhew that, according to *G. Keith*, it was the *Yearly Meeting that did Contradict*, the Monthly that was Contradicted, and yet both he here acknowledges that that Monthly Meeting, was ſix Months after that Yearly Meeting, and his Advocates undertake to Demonſtrate it, by giving the dates of Each, *viz.* That of the Yearly Meeting, the 1*ſt* of the ſeventh Month 1691. That of the adjourned Meeting (which is the ſame that he calls the Monthly Meeting) the 27*th* of the 12*th* Mo. 1691. And expreſly ſay it was ſix Months after the Yearly Meeting. Now if it was the Yearly Meeting that did Contradict, and the Monthly Meeting that was Contradicted, and that Yearly Meeting was ſix Months before that Monthly Meeting, (as from *G. Keith*'s and his Advocates own words before cited, I have proved that it was) then that which was ſix Months before, did (according to *G. Keith*) contradict that which came

ſix Months after. Which how great Nonſenſe it is, *G. Keith* has already reſolved: But he cannot acquit himſelf of it; nor of a down right Falſhood, with too great Boldneſs delivered, to have excuſed himſelf from being too apt, as Learned as he is, to write Nonſenſe. Of this I expect he ſhould clear himſelf, or Confeſs himſelf Guilty of both Nonſenſe, and (which is worſe) Falſhood.

In the ſeventh Head, p. 48. Having quoted ſeveral pages (and recited ſome words) out of my *Further Diſcovery*, as p. 35, 36, 37, and 42, and 43. Where I treated about the Separation made by *G. Keith* in *America*; they ſay, *Whereas* T. Ellwood *ſhould have brought Matter of Fact, to prove* G. Keith *guilty of the Separation, inſtead thereof, he argues, as we think, unfairly by Logical Nicety. Thought*, the Proverb ſays, *is free*; and I cannot help it, if they would think ſo? But I think, (and I have found others think) that I have in that Book ſufficiently fix'd the Guilt of the Separation upon *G. Keith*, and that by fair Reaſoning, drawn from Matter of Fact, throughout twenty pages and more, from p. 36. to p. 59. And I am content to ſtand to the Readers Judgment in it. But if the Perſons whom *G. Keith* pretends to have had this Paper from, did draw it up themſelves, I wonder not at their thinking, as they ſay they do: For in the Cloſe of the former Head, the Judgment of the Yearly Meeting, is called the *Suppoſed* Judgment of the Yearly Meeting; which word doth ſo exactly reſemble *G. Keith*'s Style, that if any others brought it forth for him, I cannot think but he begot it in them. Upon this Head, *G. Keith* makes a large Comment. But it is little elſe than a Repetition of the 10*th* Section in p. 13, 14. of his *Seaſonable Information*, already anſwered in my *Further Diſcovery*, p. 42, 43, 44. Only I obſerve he here makes it a *perverſion of Philoſophy to put the Cauſe before the Effect.* Which perhaps may be as true, as it would be a *Perverſion in Husbandry*, to ſet the *Oxen before the Plow*, which is their proper place.

The

The Eighth Head being only about ſetting the *Printer's* Name to Books, I think too *trivial* to take notice of here; further than to obſerve, That it ſhews *G. Keith*, and they that he ſays favoured him, were *hard put to it* to pick up Matter out of my Book to Cavil at, when they were fain to *ſtoop* for ſuch *ſilly ſtuff* as this.

The Ninth and Laſt Head is, That *T. Ellwood alledges*, p. 91. *He did not underſtand that the Doctrine of the Faith of Chriſt, as he died, being neceſſary to our Chriſtianity and Salvation*, &c. *Was by him reputed a Doctrine in Controverſie between* G. Keith *and others in* America; *when in ſeveral Places of his Books it plainly appears it was the principal Doctrine in Controverſie.* See *Reaſons and Cauſes*, p. 8, and 21, 22. *with many others:* They muſt excuſe me in that. What appears *very plain to ſome*, does not always appear *ſo* to *others*. And I do aſſure them, that which they ſay appeared ſo plain to them, neither then did, nor yet does, appear plain to me. For I do not believe (whatever he may pretend) that there was any *real* Controverſie between Friends there, and him, whether the Faith of Chriſt, as he died, is neceſſary to our Chriſtianity and Salvation. But that the Queſtion controverted was, *Whether that Faith is abſolutely and indiſpenſibly neceſſary to all Mankind, throughout the Univerſe, ſo that none could be ſaved without it, though they had not the means, Opportunity, or Capacity to know or receive it.* And that this was indeed, *the ſtate of the Controverſy* there, I have ſince Read in the *ſtate of the Caſe*, p. 11. written by *Samuel Jennings*, while here in *England*.

It was not that I thought there was any thing of *worth* or *moment* in this Paper, that made me beſtow this *little pains* in anſwering it; nor that the particular Paſſages therein (though *G. Keith*, to ſet them off, calls them *Weighty Particulars*) have any other *weight* in them, than what is likely to *fall upon his Head*, who

brought them forth, whatever it may upon any others that assisted him therein. But the chief reason which induced me, at this time, to take any notice of them at all, was, that I might wholly *take from him all pretence* of having answered that Book of mine, out of which these Cavils were taken; so that that Book called *A Further Discovery*, as well as my last, called *Truth Defended*, may still lie with their full weight on him, unanswered in any part.

In p. 51. The Meeting being over, and Narrative ended, he adds this Note; *If any of my Adversaries object, That divers of these Proofs, here brought, were brought formerly in my Book against* W. Penn *and* G. Whitehead, *called A Short List of the Vile and Gross Errors, which* T. Ellwood *hath replied to in his Book, called* Truth Defended: *I Answer* (says he) *I know not any one of them that he has sufficiently answered unto, to give the least satisfaction to any sound Christian; his Answers being meerly Evasions and Perversions, as I should have shewn, if he had appeared.* Alas, poor man, he might with the more ease have shewed it, I not appearing to his *Imperious Summons*, if he could have shewed it at all. Why should he excuse himself by my not appearing? Neither *G. Whitehead* nor *W. Penn* appeared any more than I (they not owning his *Usurped Jurisdiction*, any more than I) and yet that hindred him not from repeating those broken Charges against them, which I had answered before in Print. If he would needs be doing, he should have proceeded methodically and fairly, and have *first* given his Auditors an account that he had *formerly* exhibited those Charges in Print; and that I in Print had answered them. Then he should have read my Answers, and refuted them, if he could; and when he had done that, it had been time enough then for him to have renewed and reinforced his Charge. But he had rather answer my Book by repeating the Charge which my Book was

an

an Anſwer to; that he thought would be the eaſieſt way. As for my former Anſwer, whether it is ſufficient and ſatisfactory, or no, he muſt give me leave, or I will take it, to tell him (notwithſtanding he has ſet himſelf on the Bench, and called me and others to the Bar, to hear our ſelves charged and proved guilty) that he and I are both *too near a kin to the Cauſe*, to be proper and competent Judges of the ſufficiency of my Anſwer. His Book and mine are both abroad, the World has them, and the World will judge of them as they ſee cauſe, whether we will or no, and ſo let them with my good will. But withall let me tell him, that until he has anſwered them, they ſtand, and will ſtand, as ſufficient againſt him. And, as ſuch, I ſtill leave them upon his Head, and expect his Anſwer to both them and this. And whereas he ſaith there are many new Proofs here brought, beſides the former; it is not unlikely but ſome there may be (though I think not many;) for that's the way of Shuffling Writers, to add ſome New Scraps to an Old Book, and then ſet it out with a New Title, for a New Book. Yet very little, I think, there is, if any thing, in his Narrative, which was not publiſhed before, either in his former *Liſt of Vile and Groſs Errors* (which I anſwered before) or in his Book of *Groſs Error and Hypocriſie detected*, now anſwered in this. And therefore, I think, I may juſtly call this Anſwer to his Narrative, an Anſwer to them all; and as ſuch I intend it.

G. Keith's *Appendix to his Narrative, and the ſeveral Charges contained therein, conſidered.*

TO his Narrative he tacks an Appendix, containing (he ſays) *ſome conſiderable Proofs out of theſe Mens Books relating to the foregoing Heads*, The firſt Paſſage he

carps at, is in *G. Whitehead*'s Book called The Divinity of Christ, p. 70. Where in Answer to *J. Owen*, who had said 'The Sacrifice denotes his (Christ's) *Humane* 'Nature, whence God is said to purchase his Church 'with his own Blood, *Acts* 20. 28. For he offered him-'self through the eternal Spirit, there was the Matter 'of the Sacrifice, which was the *Humane Nature* of 'Christ's Soul and Body, *&c. G. Whitehead* answered, 'These Passages are but darkly and confusedly expres-'sed; As also we do not read in Scripture, that the 'Blood of God, by which he purchased his Church, is 'ever called the Blood of the *Humane* Nature: Nor 'that the *Soul* of Christ was the *Humane* Nature, or was 'put to death with the Body (for the wicked could not 'kill the Soul, —for his *Soul* in his own being was *im-'mortal*, and the *Nature* of God is *Divine*, and there-'fore that the Blood of God should be of *Humane* (or 'Earthly) Nature, appears intonsistent; And where 'doth the Scripture call the Blood of God *Humane*, 'or *Human* Nature? *&c.* It is plain enough from hence, That *G. Whitehead*'s Exception lay against the word *Human*, which he explains by *Earthly*, to shew he took it in that signification wherein it is derived, *ab Humo*, from the Ground or Earth; in which sence it is not a fit or proper Term to express the Blood of God, or the Soul of Christ, nay, nor his outward Man by: For his outward Body, which was nailed to the Cross, was not of a *Meer Earthly* Extraction; there was *more of Divinity* even in that Body than in the Bodies of other men, which rendred it *too Heavenly* to be called *Humane* or *Earthly*. But though *G. Whitehead* rejected the word *Humane* or *Earthly*, with respect to Christ's Manhood and Holy Nature, and to the Blood of God, wherewith he purchased his Church, and could not admit that his Soul was put to death (though it, with the Body, was made an Offering for Sin, and so it is, in a figurative manner of

speak-

ſpeaking, ſaid, that *he poured it out to death*) yet he never denied the Manhood of Chriſt, nor the ſufferings thereof, both inwardly and outwardly, nor the virtue, merit and efficacy of thoſe ſufferings; Nor is there any thing in thoſe words of his which *G. Keith* hath quoted, that imports he did. But in the progreſs of his Anſwer to *J. Owen* in the next page, mentioning both the Travel and Sufferings of Chriſt's Soul under the Burden of Man's Tranſgreſſion, and the ſuffering of his Body, under the violence of the wicked hands, to death, and the ſhedding of his Blood, *&c.* he adds, We deſire all may have as good an eſteem of Chriſt, in his ſufferings, as may be. Therefore *G. Keith* doth very unjuſtly, and like himſelf, in inſinuating as if *G. Whitehead* had denied the Manhood of Chriſt.

He takes ſome pains to *excuſe himſelf*, for having formerly (as he pretended to excuſe others) cited thoſe words of *Hilarius*, *Quid per Naturam Humani corporis conceptu ex Spiritu Sancto Caro judicatur*, i. e. *Why is the Fleſh conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, judged by the Nature of an Human Body.* But, ſays he, neither *Hilarius* nor I judged that the Body, though conceived of the Holy Ghoſt, was any part of the ſubſtance of the Holy Ghoſt. No more, ſay I, do we: Yet being conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, through the overſhadowing of the Power of the Moſt High, that Body was more Pure and Heavenly, than the Bodies of other Men, and above the Epithet Humane or Earthly. The Book he mentions, in which, he ſays, he cited thoſe words of *Hilarius*, which he calls, *The True Chriſt owned*, I do not remember I have ever ſeen. But in another Book of his, called *The Rector Corrected*, Printed the next year after that, *viz.* in 1680. he gives the ſame ſentence out of *Hilarius*, and tells us, p. 29. *Hilarius* ſaith, concerning the Body of Chriſt, that was born of the Virgin, '*Jeſus* '*Chriſt was not formed by the Nature of Humane Conception,*

'and that *the Original of his Body, is not of an Humane* 'Conception. And as there he ſpake for *Hilarius*, ſo in 'p. 27. ſpeaking for himſelf, he ſays, even the outward 'and viſible Fleſh, which he took of the Virgin, ſeeing '*it was not produced or formed by Humane Generation*, but 'by a *Divine Conception*, through the Overſhadowing of 'the Holy Ghoſt, and did *far excel* the Fleſh of all 'other Men that ever were ſince; inaſmuch alſo, 'that after death, it was not ſubject to Corruption; 'the name *Humane* [Mark] is but *too mean* a Title, 'whereby to expreſs it; far leſs ſhould it be ſo called 'now, when it is glorified, and it is *altogether Heavenly* 'and Spiritual. Nor doth the Scripture any where 'give unto his Body ſuch a name as *Humane*, ſaid he then. And who would then have thought, that he would have come to plead for the word *Humane*, with reſpect to Chriſt's both Fleſh and Soul, and condemn us for Hereticks for not uſing it?

But concerning the Excellency of Chriſt's Body, hear what he ſaid, in the year 1678. in his Book called *The way to the City of God*, which now, poor man, he is *quite beſide*, p. 131. 'Even according to that Birth he '[Chriſt] was the Son of God, no leſs than the Son 'of Man, as having *God for his Father*, as he had the 'Virgin *Mary* for his Mother. Now the Child, (ſays 'he) we know, doth partake an Image or Nature *from* 'both Parents; And thus did Chriſt, who did partake 'of the Nature and Image of Man, from the Seed of '*Mary*, but did partake of a Nature and Image *much* 'more excellent, than that of Man, in its greateſt Glo-'ry, from God and his Seed, who did really ſow a moſt 'divine and heavenly Seed in the Virgins Womb, which 'as it ſupplied the Males Seed, ſo it had *much more in* 'it, and brought forth a Birth, which as it had the 'true and whole Nature of Man, ſo, I ſay, it had *a* 'Perfection above it, and that not only in accidental

'qualities

'qualities (as men will readily confeſs) but even in 'ſubſtance and *Eſſence*. And yet we muſt be now anathematized, and that by him, for denying that Body to be *Humane* or *Earthly*.

He ſays, p. 53. G. Whitehead's *Objection againſt the word Humane, as ſignifying Earthly, hath the ſame force againſt calling Chriſt* Adam, *coming from the Hebrew word* Adamah, *that ſignifieth Earth*. From hence, firſt I muſt deſire the Reader to obſerve, that *G. Keith* ſaw well enough where the ground of *G. Whitehead*'s Objection lay, *viz.* (as I have expreſſed it before) upon the word *Humane*, as ſignifying *Earthly*. This ſhews that he is a *meer Caviller*, and ſeeks occaſions to quarrel, and defame without cauſe. Next I muſt tell him, That Chriſt is not called *Adam* in a *ſtrict* and *proper* ſenſe, but in a *figurative*, with alluſion to the Firſt Man, who was of the Earth, Earthy, (as being made of the duſt of the ground) and therefore was in a proper ſenſe called *Adam*. But whereas he ſays, the Scripture calleth the Man Chriſt the Second *Adam*; and that the Man Chriſt had not only that which was heavenly, but had even our earthly part, but without ſin; I muſt put him in mind, that in his *Appendix* to his *Immediate Revelation* (for I ſhall be ever now and then trumping up ſome or other of his Old Doctrines in his way, till he will be ſo honeſt and plain, as openly to retract them) he ſaid, p. 226. 'This *ſame* Jeſus, or *Heavenly Man*, or 'Second *Adam*, was *before that Body of Fleſh* which he 'took upon him, yea *from the very beginning*. Look there now; He was, it ſeems, the *Second Adam* before he took on him that Body of Fleſh, yea, even from the beginning: But had he our Earthly part? or any thing that might be called Earthly, or Humane, from the beginning?

Another of his Cavils againſt *G. Whitehead* is about Repentance; that *T. Danſon* having affirmed that there

is

is a continual need of Faith and Repentance in this Life; *G. Whitehead* answereth, *That there is a continual need of Repentance, this I deny: for true Repentance, where it is wrought, and the fruits of it brought forth, this is unto Salvation never to be repented of, and is attended with a real forsaking of sin and transgression.* These words of *G. Whitehead*'s he says are in the same Answer to *T. Danson*'s Synopsis. But he names no page; and there are about 100 pages in that part of the Book. It was unfairly done of him (if it was by design, and not through oversight that the Page was omitted,) to give me the trouble, and waste of time, to turn over the Book to seek the place, which at length I have found in page 33, 34. and find the words cited are an Answer to an Argument *T. Danson* brought to prove the *necessity of a Continuance in Sin*, or the *impossibility of being freed from Sin in this Life*. And that *G. Keith wrangles* upon the *Grammatical* sense of the word Repentance, which he gives diversly. Whereas the place he quotes shews *G. Whitehead*'s meaning was only, That there is no *continual* need of Repentance, from a necessity of *continual* sinning. For he says, where true Repentance is wrought, and the fruits of it brought forth, it is attended with a real forsaking of Sin and Transgression, and this is unto Salvation never to be repented of.

In p. 54. Referring to his having said in the Narrative, That *G. Whitehead* hath allegorized away the Birth, Death, Resurrection and Coming again of Christ without us, to Judgment; he offers some instances out of *G. Whitehead*'s Books, which he calls *Plain Proofs*; and so they are indeed, but not at all of those things for which he brings them, but of his own both *Envy* and *Folly*.

First, He says, *G. Whitehead* allegorizes away his Birth, spoken of by *Isaiah* 9.6. *Unto us a Child is born, a Son is given.* This, he says, he expoundeth of Christ, born

born within; *He-Goats Horn*, p. 51. To this I need but give him his own Answer, which he formerly gave to the Rector of *Arrow* in his Book called *The Rector Corrected*, p. 30. *viz. But why may it not speak of both* (to wit, his being born outwardly, and his being born within) *the one without prejudice of the other?* *Dost thou not know that Maxim, Subordinata non Pugnant? Subordinates are not contrary.* And although *G. Whitehead* in the place cited, from *Rom.* 8. 29. said, *Christ was the First-born in many Brethren*, ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς; And thereupon asked, *Was not Isaiah one of these Brethren? who had been as with Child*, Isa. 26. 17. (which place *G. Keith* may see how he rendred in his *Immediate Revelation*, *Appendix* p. 249.) Yet *G. Whitehead* did not deny Christ's outward Birth; but mentions his *coming in the Flesh*, and tells his Opponent he had belyed *R. H.* and him, in charging them with counting Christ's Coming in the Flesh to be but a Figure: for, says he, *It was never so affirmed by us.*

His Second Instance is, That *G. Whitehead* allegorizes away Christ's Resurrection, expressly denying that Christ was bodily seen of *Paul*, and perverting that place in 1 *Cor.* 15. 8. to Christ within. For proof of this he cites only page 51. but names no Book; which made me suppose (and I think reasonably) he referred to the Book he had quoted last before, which was the *He-Goats Horn*. But in that Book and Page, there is nothing of the matter, not so much as the name *Paul*, nor any Text out of his Epistle to the Corinthians. Neither know I where to seek the place. All therefore that I think fit to say to this Cavil at this time is, That if *G. Whitehead* had denied that Christ was bodily seen of *Paul*, that had not allegorized away Christ's Resurrection. I wish *G. Keith* don't allegorize away his own wits.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, He ſays, *G. Whitehead* allegorizeth away his Coming without us to Judgment, in theſe Scriptures, *Mat.* 16. 27, 28. 1 *Theſ.* 4. 15, 16, 17, 18. for which he cites *Light and Life*, p. 40, 41. But beſides that theſe very places are already inſtanced, and diſcuſſed in the Narrative. *G. Keith* in urging that Text, *Mat.* 16.28. for Chriſt's Coming without us to Judgment, doth as *flatly contradict* himſelf, as ever man did. For in his *Way Caſt up* (which he is now *Caſting down*) p. 143, 144. he ſaid, 'Chriſt himſelf hath taught us, that his 'Spiritual Coming in his Saints, is *as the Son of Man*; '(and quotes this very Text for it) Mat. 16. 28. *Ve-*'*rily, I ſay unto you, there are ſome ſtanding here*, that '*ſhall not taſte of death, till they ſee the Son of Man com-*'*ing in his Kingdom.* Now mark, '*This* (ſays he) *can-*'*not be meant of his laſt Coming at the Day of Judgment*, 'elſe it would infer that ſome that heard him ſpeak 'theſe words, have not as yet taſted of death, nor ſhall 'unto the laſt day, which is abſurd! Therefore *this* '*Coming of the Son of Man muſt be his Inward and Spi-*'*ritual Coming into his Saints.* Can one think it any thing but *judicial Blindneſs* from God upon this Man, that makes him thus *break his own Head*!

Fourthly, He ſays, Both he and *R. H.* allegorize away his Burial, for which he cites, *Light and Life*, p. 52. and *He-Goat's Horn*, p. 62. *perverting that Scripture*, Iſa. 53. *He made his Grave with the wicked: He adulterates* (ſays *G. Keith*) *the True Tranſlation, and turns it, in the wicked*, &c. In p 52. of *Light and Life*, there is no mention of Chriſt's Burial; but only he is ſaid to be a Lamb ſlain from the Foundation of the World, and *made his Grave with the Wicked, and with the Rich in his Death*: So here the Text is rendred *with* the Wicked not *in* the wicked. The other place, in *He-Goats Horn*, p. 62. is *R. Hubberthorn's*, diſtinct from *G. Whitehead*, and it neither mentions *Iſa.* 53. nor treats of the General Reſurrection,

on, or the Reſurrection of the Body; but only anſwers ſome Cavilling Queries, put by *J. Horn*, about the two Seeds, and therefore is perverſly applyed by *G. Keith* to the Reſurrection of the Body.

Laſtly, He ſays, *G. Whitehead* allegorizeth away the Reſurrection of the Saints Bodies by his perverſion of *Phil.* 3. 21. to a Change of the Body that the Apoſtles and Saints witneſſed before death. But he quotes no place, neither Page nor Book, for this. But he tells us that *G. Whitehead* in his *Real Quaker a Real Proteſtant*, p. 105. *underſtands that very Place of a Change of the vile, or low and humble Body, like unto the glorious Body of Chriſt, as a thing to come.* And by this I underſtand that *G. Keith* hath ſufficiently *diſproved* the *proofleſs* Proof he brought before *againſt G. Whitehead*, by bringing this *for* him; ſo that I need ſay no more to it. That which I would obſerve to the Reader is, that *G. Keith* of all men is moſt unjuſt in charging *G. Whitehead* with allegorizing, who has indulged himſelf ſo far in that way of Writing, that ſcarce *Origen* himſelf has abounded more in Allegories.

From *Allegories* he proceeds to give ſome of *G. Whitehead's Contradictions*, as he would have them to be taken; of which he gives two or three Inſtances, how idle and improper, will eaſily be ſeen. The Firſt he aſſigns is, That *G. Whitehead* in his *Light and Life*, p. 69. *thinks him a very Blind and Ignorant Man, that reckons Bodies Celeſtial and Terreſtrial to be all one in Matter and Subſtance*; and yet the ſame *G. Whitehead* in *Malice of the Independent Agent*, p. 17. owns that *Chriſt's Body now in Heaven is the ſame in ſubſtance he had on Earth: So by his own words* (ſays *G. Keith*) *he hath declared himſelf to be a Blind and Ignorant Man, and yet Infallible, otherwiſe by his own word No True Miniſter.* But hold a little: Did *G. Whitehead* ever call or own Chriſt's Body now in Heaven, or while it was on Earth, to be *Terreſtrial*, or

or of the *Earth?* If he did not, G. *Keith* is clearly out with his idle pretence of Contradiction. Hath he forgotten what he told *Cotton Mather* in his *Serious Appeal*, p. 23. That *Contradictions lie not betwixt two Particulars, nor two Universals; but one Particular, and another Universal:* And that a *Contradiction is not betwixt two Positives; but the One Positive, the Other Negative.* And that is not enough neither; for in his *Truth's Defence*, p. 191. he puts his Opponent *J. A.* in mind of a *Rule* in his *School Logick*, That *Propositions are not contradictory, although the one be Affirmative, and the other Negative, unless they be* in ordine ad idem, *in order to the same, and in regard of the same Circumstances of Time, Place, Condition,* &c. Now let him make out his *Contradictions*, if he can, according to these *Maxims*, who hath already blamed *G. Whitehead* (and that but just now) for denying Christ's Body to be *Terrestrial*, or *Earthly*, and therefore refusing to call it *Humane.*

Another Contradiction he pretends to find in *G. Whitehead* is, that in a late Printed half Sheet, called, *The Christian Faith, he owns Christ to be both God and Man,* &c. and yet, says he, *it is proved in the above Narrative, that he neither owneth him to be God or Man.* Here *G. Keith* brings his own *Narrative* to prove that what that *Narrative* says is true; *Is not that pretty?* Whereas what he has charged *G. Whitehead* with in that *Narrative*, is denyed, and rejected as false; and the Proofs he has pretended to bring out of *G. Whitehead*'s Books, upon a due Examination, prove to be but *G. Keith*'s *Perversions* and Misconstructions of *G. Whitehead*'s Words, as from the former Part of this Discourse, will I believe appear. The like Method he takes in the following Instance of Contradiction, referring to his *Narrative* for Proof. And in his Fourth and Last Instance, p. 55. (which is of *G. Whitehead*'s signing among others) a Treatise against Oaths, wherein it is

said

ſaid, We look upon it to be no leſs than a preſumptuous tempting of God, to ſummon him as a Witneſs, not only to our Terrene, but Trivial buſineſs; *&c.* and his now admitting it lawful to declare the Truth in the preſence of God, *&c.* He ſeems to put no difference between *ſummoning God as a VVitneſs, and ſpeaking the Truth in the Preſence of God, who is VVitneſs of the Truth ſpoken*; and yet he might have ſeen, in the place he cites, what was meant by *ſummoning God as a VVitneſs*, viz. That it is vain and inſolent to think that a Man, when he pleaſeth, can make the great God of Heaven a Witneſs, or a Judge, in any Matter, to appear by ſome ſignal Approbation or Judgment, to help or forſake him, as the Truth or Falſeneſs of his Oath requires, when he ſaith, *So help me God.* If *G. Keith* will not ſee a difference betwixt ſpeaking *with Imprecation*, and *without*, others do; and that that difference deſtroys his pretended Contradiction.

In p. 55. He has an envious Fling at *G. Fox*, from whom he ſuggeſts *G. Whitehead* (and many others) did receive *unchriſtian Doctrine*, and he mentions a Paper of *G. Fox*'s, directed *to all People in Chriſtendom*, &c. Which, he ſays, hath *very unſound and unchriſtian Doctrine concerning Chriſt's Fleſh.* This Paper I have not ſeen, nor heard of before, that I remember. How faithfully he recites out of it, I know not. But this I obſerve from what he cites, that whereas he ſays, by Chriſts Fleſh *G. Fox* meaneth *not his outward Fleſh*, the very firſt Words, he cites, are, *Chriſt, according to the Fleſh crucified:* Was not that his *outward Fleſh* that was *Crucified?* 'Tis true, *G. Fox* ſays there (as *G. Keith* cites him) *It was never corrupted.* But that doth not prove he did not mean the *outward Fleſh:* For I hope *G. Keith* will not ſay; That, that ever corrupted. But ſurely, *G. Keith* might have forborn falling thus foully on *G. Fox*, for unſound and unchriſtian Doctrine,

ctrine, now that he is gone to Reſt, conſidering *how highly he writ of him*, while he was living. For in his *Rector corrected*, p. 211. he ſaid, not only that *the Lord had made* G. Fox *a worthy Inſtrument unto us, and among us*, (*and he hoped, yet ſhould, unto many more*) but, that *he was ſafe in the hand of him that holdeth the ſeven Stars, and the ſeven golden Candleſticks in his right Hand*; And (ſaid he to the Rector) *All thy malicious Reviling and ſlanderous Defamation of him, cannot diminiſh any thing from that true Honour, wherewith the Lord hath honoured him, and other faithful Labourers with him, whom the Lord hath raiſed up in this Day of the Appearance of his great and mighty Power.* Can *G. Keith* read this without *Bluſhing*, to ſee how he is repeating the Rector's *malicious Reviling*, and *ſlanderous Defamation* of *G. Fox*, and other faithful Labourers with him, that he might try if he could diminiſh that true Honour wherewith the Lord hath honoured *G. Fox*, which he told the Rector he could not? I gather from *G. Keith*'s Words, that this Paper of *G. Fox*'s, which he charges with very unſound and unchriſtian Doctrine, is of older Date than his Book in Anſwer to the Rector. Is he not aſhamed, ſo openly to *contradict himſelf*, as to charge a Man, that he was *guilty of very unſound and unchriſtian Doctrine*, at the ſame time that he had proclaimed him ſuch a *worthy Inſtrument of the Lord's making*, and had affirmed he was then *ſafe in the Hand of him*, that holdeth the ſeven Stars, and the ſeven golden Candleſticks in his right Hand?

In p. 56. Having done with *G. Whitehead*, he falls upon *W. Penn* again, firſt, For ſome Paſſages which he calls unſound and ſcandalous, and then for ſome Contradictions, as he would make them.

The Firſt Paſſage he brings againſt him is out of his *Rejoynder to* J. Faldo, p. 179, 180. about the Excommunication of *Robert Norwood* by *Sidrach Sympſon*, an eminent

eminent Preacher among the Independents. Where *W. Penn* (*not to defend* Norwood, but to ſhew *Faldo* that he had dealt by the Quakers, ſomewhat like as *Sympſon* had done by *Norwood*) ſets down *Norwood*'s Opinion, and *Sympſons* Charge againſt him upon it. *Norwood* it ſeems denied the *Locality of Heaven and Hell*; and believed *the Soul to have been breathed from God*, and therefore aſſigned to it, ſomething more of Divinity than the uſual opinion doth. *Sympſon* ſtretched this, to be a denial of *any Heaven and Hell at all*; and a rendring the Soul, *God it ſelf*. W. Penn ſhewing how ſeverely *Norwood* was dealt with only for Opinion, added (in a Parentheſis) *and that not very offenſive*. This Expreſſion *G. Keith* catches hold of, and deals by *W. Penn*, as *Sympſon* did by *Norwood*, that is, he ſtretches it to the *worſt* Conſtruction he could make, and far beyond what it could bear. For, whereas by the Word *Locality* of Heaven and Hell, it is probable no more was intended than that Heaven and Hell were not certain particular Places, or parts of the World ſet out, bounded and limited to any certain and determinate Dimenſions (as the Heathen Poets deſcribed their *Elyſium* to be) *G. Keith* would repreſent *W. Penn*, as thinking it not very offenſive to deny, that *Chriſt's Body that was raiſed from the Dead, is in any Heaven*, that is, an outward place, or without us. And then *ſtretches out his Throat*, with a *loud Appeal* to all ſincere Chriſtians, that *this is really ſo offenſive, that the denying of that one Truth* (of ſuch a Locality I ſuppoſe he does not mean, but of Chriſt's Body not being in any Heaven without us) *is a plain denial of one of the greateſt Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, and ſo makes void the whole, to any that holds ſuch a damnable Opinion*; which I am perſwaded *Rob. Norwood* did *not hold*, and I am confident *W. Penn* never dreamt of. For though he ſaid of *Norwood*'s Opinion, it is *not very offenſive*, as he underſtood it, andcompared with what

Sympſon repreſented it: Yet his calling it not *very* offenſive, ſhews he held it to be *offenſive*, and was *offended* at it. His Cavil upon the other part of *Norwood*'s Opinion, by which he would reflect upon *W. Penn* is, that *the Soul of Man is a created Being*, and hath *nothing of Divinity eſſential to it*, p. 57. *Norwood*'s Opinion, as *W. Penn* mentioned it, has no ſuch Word as *eſſential* in it: He only ſaid, *he believed the Soul to have been breathed from God*, thereby aſſigning to it *ſomething more of Divinity* than the uſual Opinion doth. And *G. Keith* here acknowledges, That *the Divine Power that made the Soul of Man, is in it, and operateth in it more manifeſtly, than in the inferiour Creatures.* Therefore he might have ſpared all this Cavil.

But he has not yet done with *Norwood*, becauſe he is not yet willing to have done with *VV. Penn*, *Norwood*, in his Anſwer to *Sympſon*'s Excommunication, (who had charged him with withdrawing himſelf from the People of God) ſaid, *Are none the People of God, but your ſelves?* This *VV. Penn* ſaid was *Argumentum ad hominem* to *J. Faldo*, who had repreſented the Quakers *as worſe than* the Heathens and Mahometans. *G. Keith* catches at this too, and reckons (though without his Hoſt) this is as good an Argument for him againſt *VV. Penn*, and the Yearly Meeting that denied him, becauſe they call themſelves *the Church of Chriſt*; as if, ſays he, *they were the only Church of Chriſt.* He once thought them ſo, no doubt; and if he does not think them ſo now, he muſt think ſome other Body of People to be it: For as Chriſt has a Church, ſo he has *but one* Church in the World. I ſpeak not of *particular Gatherings* with reſpect to Place, but of all that are of one and the ſame Fellowſhip in all Places, throughout the whole World. Neither ſpeak I with reſpect to *particular Perſons*, but with reſpect to a gathered People, (which is both the common, and the true Notion of a Church.) That we, the People called Quakers, are the Church of Chriſt, is

no

no Presumption in us to affirm, nor ought to be offensive to others to hear, since we therein claim no more to our selves, than every other Body of professed Christians challenge to themselves; namely, that they and they only (as a gathered People) are the true Church of Christ. But for this, *Protestantism* had never been, neither *Name* nor *Thing*. Had the *Protestants* believed the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church of Christ, they would not have withdrawn from her Communion; as neither would the several sorts of Protestants have successively *separated* from one another, had they believed those they *separated from*, to be the true Church of Christ. For who (but *G. Keith*) would be so Mad, to disjoyn himself from that People, which he believed to be the true Church of Christ? Yet I do not think, that of the several sorts of Professors of Christianity, who have left those Religious Societies or Fellowships they were once of, any were so devoid of Charity, as to think there were no good Persons, none that feared God, none that sought and breathed after him, and sincerely desired the Knowledge of his Will, that they might do it, among those People whom they parted from. But that honesty, and those good desires, in such *particular Persons*, though it had and hath acceptance with the Lord, and was, and is answered by him with sweet and comfortable Discoveries of himself unto them; yet it makes not those *Gatherings*, or *Bodies* of People, amongst which such *particular Persons* are, to be the *Church* of Christ. So we (whom the World calls Quakers) whom the Lord God hath raised up in this Age, and gathered by the invisible Arm of his Divine Power, to be a peculiar People to himself, though we dare not but own, and declare our selves to be *the Church of Christ*; yet we have always acknowledged, and do, that as of old, in every Nation, *He that feared God, and wrought Righteousness, was accepted with him*, Acts 10. 35. So now, in e-

very Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Religion, he or ſhe that fears God and worketh Righteouſneſs, that *hungers* and *thirſts* after the Lord, with deſire to know more of his Will, that they may do it, and who walk faithfully with him, according to what they already know of him; ſuch are accepted with him, according to the Sincerity he finds in them, though clouded in their Underſtandings, through Education or Tradition. Such as theſe we do not deny to belong to Chriſt, and to be dear unto him, and taken care of by him: Yet that makes not any of thoſe *intire Bodies* of People, amongſt any of whom theſe are, to be *the true Church of Chriſt*. *G. Keith* mentions alſo theſe Words, as out of a Paper of *Solomon Eccles*, *The Quakers are in Truth, and none but they*. I have not ſeen that Paper, that I remember, nor know how fairly he hath cited the Words; but before *G. Keith* out of a pettiſh Spleen, forſook the Quakers, he (I ſuppoſe) would have ſaid the ſame, The Quakers, ſo called, are in the Truth, no *Body of People* that we know of are ſo *inwardly gathered* to the Truth, as the People called Quakers are. He alſo flings at us a ſaying of *E. Burrough*'s to the People called *Quakers*, thus, *The Tabernacle of God is with you, and his dwelling Place is among you, and only among you is God known*, p. 64. of his Works. *E. Burrough*'s Words are, 'You who are called Quakers, who are ſo, not only 'in Word, nor in ſhew, but in Life and in Power, whom 'God hath called and choſen to Place his Name in, and to 'take up his Habitation among, above all the Families of 'the Earth; the Tabernacle of God is with you, *&c.* This alſo is very true, if it be truly underſtood: For though the Lord is good and gracious *to all*, and doth anſwer the Breathings and good Deſires of the honeſt hearted, and doth viſit them in loving Kindneſs, and extend of his Mercies and Goodneſs unto them, *in every Profeſſion*, and amongſt every gathered People; yet his Tabernacle and Dwelling Place is with and among *his peculiar*

liar People, and he is not *ſo known* among any other People, *as an imbodied People*, in that full, inward, ſpiritual, living, ſenſible, experimental Manner and Degree, as he is known among us his Poor deſpiſed People called *Quakers*, whom *G. Keith* has taken all this Pains to wreak his Revenge and Malice upon, and to ſtir up and engage all other People againſt, if he could. But the Lord, who ſees the Wickedneſs of his Heart, knows how both to reward him, and to preſerve us, in whom alone we truſt.

Out of the ſame Book of *W. Penn*, *G. Keith* picks another Paſſage, which he ſays, is *either perfect Nonſenſe*, *or Antichriſtian Doctrine*; and becauſe he cannot tell which, he concludes, *or rather indeed both*. It is a queſtion whether *perfect Nonſenſe* may be properly called *Doctrine* either *Chriſtian*, or *Antichriſtian*. But upon due Conſideration, I think, he will find neither Nonſenſe, nor Antichriſtian Doctrine in it. It is in p. 310. of *W. Penn's Rejoynder*, to *J. Faldo*, and it is given as a Reaſon (among many others) why the Body of Chriſt, which was nailed to the Croſs, *ſimply conſidered by it ſelf*, and abſtractly from that Divine Life and Power which dwelt in it, ſhould not be called the *Chriſt*, viz. 'Becauſe, 'that Fleſh of Chriſt is called a *Vail*, but he himſelf is '*within* the Vail, which is the *Holy of Holies*, whereinto 'Chriſt Jeſus our High Prieſt hath entred, *Heb.* 10. 20, '21. And as he deſcended into, and paſſed through a '*Suffering* State in his *Fleſhly* Appearance, and returned 'into that State of *Immortality* and *Eternal Life* and *Glo-'ry*, from whence he humbled himſelf, which was and 'is the *Holy of Holies* (then obſcured or hid by his *Fleſh* 'or Body, the *Vail*, while in the World:) So muſt all 'know a Death to their Fleſhly Ways and Religions, yea 'their Knowledge of Chriſt himſelf after the Fleſh, or 'they *ſtick in the Vail*, and never enter into the *Holy of* 'Holies, nor come to know him in any *ſpiritual* Relati-'on, as their High and Holy *Prieſt* that abides therein.

First, Where's the *Nonsense* here, the *perfect Nonsense*, this great *Judge of Sense* complains of? Why, if he cannot find it, he'l *make it*, rather than not Cavil. For says he, *His saying Christ hath entred into the Holy of Holies within the Vail, and that Vail is his Flesh, and that Holy of Holies is himself. What Nonsense is this?* says he, *Was not Christ always in himself?* But *where did* W. Penn *say, That Holy of Holies is Christ himself?* Find me those Words in the whole Paragraph. Nay does he not plainly say *otherwise*. Does he not expresly call that *State of Immortality*, and Eternal Life and Glory, from whence Christ humbled himself, and into which he returned, the Holy of Holies? Read the Words again. And as he descended into, and past through a Suffering State in his fleshly Appearance, and returned into *that State of Immortality*, and Eternal Life and Glory, from whence he humbled himself, *which was* and is the Holy of Holies: So, *&c.* Pray, what is the *Antecedent* here to the *Relative Which*, but the Word *State*, going before? *G. Keith* is too well versed in *Grammar*, not to know and see this; I would he were but half so well versed in *Honesty*: For this is a plain *dishonest Perversion*, for which he deserves, at least, the *Contempt* and *Censure* of every honest Reader, who by this Instance may see the ways *G. Keith* takes to make his Opponent speak Nonsense or Antichristian Doctrine.

He goes on with the *like Honesty* in his *second Note* upon these Words of *W. Penn* thus, *His entring in within the Vail of his Flesh, is either perfect Nonsense, or it hath this Sense, That he hath put off his Body he had on Earth, and is separated from it.* This is a plain *Perversion* also: For *his entring in within the Vail* is clearly explained, by those Words of *his returning into that State of Immortality, and Eternal Life and Glory* (called the Holy of Holies) *which he was in before he humbled himself to take on him that Flesh*, which was called a *Vail*, because it *vailed* or hid from Men the Glory of his Godhead that dwelt in it. Both

Vail

Vail and *Holy of Holies*, are *Metaphorical* Expreſſions, borrowed from the *Legal Tabernacle*: And as there, in the *Type*, they were uſed to ſet forth a difference of *Places*, with reſpect to *Degrees* of *Holineſs*: So here, in the *Antitype*, they are uſed to ſet forth a difference of *States*, with reſpect to *Degrees* of *Glory*. The *State* of Chriſt's *Humiliation*; when he appeared in the *form of a Servant*, in that Body of Fleſh which was called *The Vail*, was very glorious: But the *State* of his *Exaltation* into that *Immortality*, Eternal Life and Glory, which he had with his Father before the World began, which is called, *The Holy of Holies*, is a far more glorious State. Yet doth not his entring into this State imply, that he has *put off* his Body he had on Earth, and is ſeparated from it: For that Body, being glorified, is in Heavenly Glory with him. But it is probable he raiſed this Cavil, as to defame *W. Penn*, ſo alſo to introduce a Story, which hereupon he tells, of one *R. Young* in *Penſilvania*, who he ſays affirmed this. But that he did ſo, *G. Keith* gives no Proof, but his own Word, which is juſtly, in things of this kind, of no Credit with me, who have ſo often found and proved him falſe.

He makes a *Third* note upon thoſe words of *W. Penn* before cited, and that with as little Honeſty as before. For from *W. Penn*'s ſaying; All muſt know a *Death* to their *Knowledge* of Chriſt after the *Fleſh*, G. Keith ſays, *It is plain from his words, that he hath this unſound ſenſe of it, that they muſt know a Death to the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, as the Fleſh ſignifieth the Fleſh of Chriſt, as he came in the Fleſh.* But as this Comment is not very *perfect ſenſe* (and yet I will not call it *perfect Nonſenſe*) ſo it is plain that he perverts *W. Penn*'s words to a *wrong ſenſe*, and therein Abuſes him. For *W. Penn*'s words are. *All muſt know a Death to their Fleſhly ways and Religions* (which word, [*Fleſhly ways and Religions*] *G. Keith* left out, ſee his Abominable Falſhood and Treachery) *Yea, their knowledge of Chriſt himſelf after the*

Fleſh, &c. Which words, *Fleſhly ways and Religions*, ſhew what *ſort* of Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, he meant all muſt know a Death to, *viz.* Their Fleſhly Knowledge (as *Fleſhly* is oppoſed to *Spiritual*) or that Knowledge which they *in their Carnal Minds* have comprehended, or gathered in, and in which too many reſt, without preſſing after the Divine and Spiritual Knowledg of the *End* of Chriſt's coming in the Fleſh, and the *Bleſſed effects* thereof, and *manifold Benefits* that accrue thereby, to them that receive him in his *Spiritual* Appearance. But how *malicious* a mind muſt he have, who from thoſe words would infer, that *W. Penn* would have all to Die to the Knowledge of Chriſt after the Fleſh, ſo as not to know that he ever came in the Fleſh.

In p. 58. *G. Keith* cites a Paſſage out of a Book of *W. Penn*'s, called *Truth Exalted*, and with all rents a Quotation he gave before in his *Narrative*, p. 21. out of a Book called *The Chriſtian Quaker*, (which the Reader may find anſwered before) From both which he infers, that *he and* G. Whitehead, *and many other Teachers among the Quakers, have no other Notion of Chriſt, but an Inward Principle.* This is ſuch a *known Falſhood*, and *Apparent Slander*, Contradicted by almoſt all our Books, and ſo fully diſproved in many places of this Book, that it neither deſerves nor needs any other Anſwer here, than a bare Denyal.

To his unjuſt Charge of unſound Paſſages, he adds two or three ſeeming Contradictions, which he would faſten upon *W. Penn.* The Firſt is, That in *A Treatiſe of Oaths* (mentioned before) he is earneſt againſt all Oaths under the Goſpel, and yet in his *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 180. he uſeth (ſaith *G. Keith*) the greateſt Oath that ever was uſed among the Jews. The Inſtance he gives is in theſe words, directed to *T. Hicks. O that theſe heavy things might not be laid to thy Charge, for ſo ſure as God liveth* (there's his Catch) *great will be the*

wrath

wrath that ſhall follow; Yea, God will viſit for theſe unrighteous Dealings; And I teſtify to thee from God's living Spirit, if thou deſiſt not, and come not to deep Repentance, the Lord will make thee an example of his Fury, and thy Head ſhall not go down to the Grave in Peace, &c. This I take to be a *meer Cavil*, and a very weak one too. For firſt, That form of Speech [*as the Lord liveth*] though it was ſometimes uſed among the Jews of Old, as an Oath, yet it was not *always ſo*; nor do I think *G. Keith* will take it to be intended for an Oath, in *all thoſe places* where he Reads it in the Bible; as particularly in 1 *Sam.* 25, 26. Where *Abigail* uſed it to *David* Concerning his Enemies. See alſo Chap. 26.10. and Chap. 29.6. 1 *Ki.* 17. 12. and 18. 10. 2 *Ki.* 22. 4. 6. and Chap. 4. 30. *Job.* 27. 2. with many other places in the Books of *Samuel* and the *Kings*, where it is uſed ſometimes ſingly [as the Lord liveth,] ſometimes with this Addition, [*and as thy Soul liveth*;] Yea, and ſometimes, this latter Expreſſion [as thy Soul liveth] is uſed without the former, as in 1 *Sam.* 1. 26. and 17. 55. 2 *Sam.* 11. 11, 14, 19. Yet neither with it, nor without it, was intended for an Oath. Secondly, There is a difference between thoſe two forms of Speech [*As the Lord liveth*] and [*ſo ſure as God liveth*] for though the former was formerly uſed as an Oath, yet the latter never was ſo uſed or taken; but is only *a Perſuaſive Form of Speech*, uſed to ſet forth the *unqueſtionable Certainty* of the thing delivered, from the *acknowledged Certainty* that God lives. In which ſenſe, and no other, it is evident *W. Penn* there uſed it; to expreſs the *Aſſurance* he had of the Truth, and Certainty of the Teſtimony he then gave againſt, and to *Tho. Hicks*. But none, I think (beſides *G. Keith*) would be ſo extravagant as to think, that in theſe words *W. Penn* intended to *take his Oath*, that the wrath of God, which ſhould follow thoſe unrighteous dealings of *T. Hicks* would be great. So to think were great Folly. How

mean

mean a Cavil then is this? And how meer a Caviller hath *G. Keith* ſhewn himſelf therein?

The latter part of *W. Penn*'s words before cited, *G. Keith* ſays, imply ſome *Prophecy* againſt *T. Hicks*, which he ſuggeſts was not *fulfilled*. But he ſhould have obſerved that what was there ſpoken of *T. Hicks* was *Conditional, if he deſiſted not, and came not to Repentance.* That he *deſiſted* is certain; that he did not come to Repentance, I ſuppoſe *G. Keith* will not adventure to ſay, that he did come to Repentance, I have heard, which that G. *Keith* alſo may do, I wiſh.

His ſecond Inſtance of Contradiction, he gives in p. 59. out of two Books of *W. Penn*'s, One called *Judas and the Jews*, p. 13. the other, *An Addreſs to Proteſtants*, p. 152. in the ſecond Edition (p. 151. in the firſt Edition) the Paſſage is concerning the Power of the Church, from thoſe words of Chriſt, *Mat.* 18. 17. *Go, tell the Church.* This place in both thoſe Books, *W. Penn* expounded of *Private Offences*, or *Perſonal Injuries*, between Brethren, which has *no ſhew of Contradiction* in it. 'Tis true that in the former, he inferr'd from thoſe words of Chriſt, *That Chriſt gave his Church Power both to try and reject Spirits.* In the other he denies that thoſe words of Chriſt do Impower the Church *to define and Impoſe upon all People, under Temporal and Eternal Puniſhment, Articles of Faith*, &c. What Contradiction is in this? He knows *Propoſitions are not Contradictory, unleſs they be* ad idem. But is it the *ſame thing* to try and reject Spirits, and to define and impoſe Articles of Faith under Temporal and Eternal Puniſhment? His note upon this, ſhews his *Falſhood*, his *Malice* and his *Weakneſs*. He ſays, *Here you ſee he* (W. Penn) *makes the Church Power very low, as by Church he means the Church of* England, *or any other Church beſide the Church of the* Quakers. *But*, ſays he, *When he means the Church of the* Quakers, *from the ſame Text, he Magnifies her Power as great as ever* Bellarmine, *or any other Jeſuit*,

ſuit, *Magnified the Church of* Rome. His *Malice* in the Compariſon is obvious of it ſelf, and his *Weakneſs* in the Cavil. His *Falſneſs* appears by this, That *W. Penn* in neither of thoſe places named, either the Church of *England*, the *Quakers* Church (as he calls it) or the Church of any other ſort of People: But the Church of Chriſt indefinitely, leaving the Application to the Reader. And the moderation that Book pleads for, is a ſufficient Confutation of this Cavil.

He adds a 3*d* Inſtance of Contradiction, as *lame* as the former. He takes the firſt part of it out of the *Addreſs to Proteſtants*, p 246. of the ſecond Edition (p. 242. of the firſt Edition) where *W. Penn* ſaid, *them that are angry for God, paſſionate for Chriſt, that call names for Religion, and fling Stones, and perſecute for Faith, may tell us they are Chriſtians, if they will, but no Body would know them to be ſuch by their Fruits; to be ſure they are no Chriſtians of Chriſts making.* To this *G. Keith* oppoſes ſome expreſſions he has pickt up out of two of *W. Penn*'s Books, which he thinks proceeded from *Anger* and *Paſſion.* But what if they did not, but from a *Juſt* and *Godly* Zeal againſt *Deceivers* and *Deceit*, as it appears they did? Does he think to prove Contradictions upon *precarious Propoſitions?* Such weak Attempts need no Refutation.

I am come at length to his Charge againſt me in particular, which in p. 60. he brings in under this Title, *Some of Tho. Ellwood's vile and groſs Errors, truly collected out of his Book, falſly called*, Truth Defended. How truly collected we ſhall ſee anon.

He premiſes that he *ſhall paſs by at preſent, my many Forgeries, and Perverſions, and Abuſes againſt him, in that laſt Book of mine, and my two Former; to the firſt, of which he ſays he has anſwered in Print.* From hence I hope, he will give me leave to Infer, that he does not pretend to have anſwered my two laſt yet; ſo that I may live in hopes of hearing from him once again, at leaſt

leaſt, if not oftner; And the rather for that he has *Collected*, he ſays, *out of my two laſt Abuſive Books* (as he calls them) *above a hundred manifeſt Perverſions, Forgeries and Falſities that I have heaped up againſt him, which* (ſays he) *I have in readineſs to ſhew, and which I keep by me for a reſerve, untill I find an Occaſion to Publiſh them, either by Print, or otherwiſe.* He's a *wary Warriour*, one may ſee by this: He won't hazard all at one Battel; but keeps a *reſerve to Recruit his Forces*, if he ſhould happen to come by the worſt, as it is more than ten to one he will. He *muſtered* up *fifty* out of my Firſt Book (called *An Epiſtle*) and ſent them forth againſt me, in his *Seaſonable Information*; Them I beat back upon himſelf, in my ſecond Book called *A further Diſcovery* (which is the firſt of thoſe two he has not replied to) ſo that he had need *re-inforce them*, if he can, and make good his *Old Charge*, before he exhibites a *New one.* And when that is done with, then let us have the *t'other hundred*, and by that time perhaps he'll have pickt ſome more out of this.

The Errors he now charges me with, are in number Ten, and all pretended to be taken out of my laſt Book, called *Truth Defended.*

The firſt he gives thus, *The Blood that came out of Chriſt's ſide, its ſhedding, was not done to compleat the Offering, becauſe before that, Chriſt ſaid,* Conſummatum eſt, *it is finiſhed*, p. 99. *Note*, ſays G. Keith, *This is as much againſt his Death, for before his Death, he ſaid, It is Finiſhed.* Now Reader, take my words: For theſe he has given are not mine, but his own; by which I ſuppoſe, he would inſinuate, that I hold the Offering or Sacrifice to have been compleated, *before Chriſt's Death*? My words were theſe, 'This offering up himſelf (and 'giving himſelf a Ranſom for all) *included all his ſufferings*, both inward and outward, and made it a 'compleat and perfect Sacrifice; in which his *Blood was 'Comprehended*, and concerned, as well as his Fleſh, *before*

'*fore his ſide was Pierced* by the Spear. For he had pro-
'nounced that great word (*Conſummatum eſt*) It is Fin-
'iſhed, had bowed his Head, and *given up the Ghoſt*, be-
'fore his ſide was Pierced by the Spear. Obſerve here now, I not only ſaid he had pronounced that great word, *It is Finiſhed*, but alſo expreſly, that he had *bowed his Head, and given up the Ghoſt, before his Side was Pierced. G. Keith* pretending to repeat my words, leaves out that Clauſe [*he had bowed his Head and given up the Ghoſt*] and then infers that my making the offering to be compleated, upon his ſaying *It is Finiſhed*, before his Side was pierced (which was not done, and which I ſay was not done, till *after he was Dead*) is a making the offering to be compleated *before he was Dead.* What ſhall I call this Dealing of his, a *Forgery*, *Falſity*, or *Perverſion?* A manifeſt *Perverſion* to be ſure it is, and that a *groſs* and *vile* one. This is the way he takes to prove me guilty of vile and groſs Errors. And at this rate, what Man living, can eſcape the *laſh of his falſe Tongue!* Is this man fit to charge me with Perverſions, Forgeries and Falſities (not by the *Dozen*, nor yet by the *Score*, but) by the *Half Hundred*, and *Hundred*!

The ſecond groſs Error he charges on me, P. 61. is, That *I Juſtify* G. Whitehead's *Doctrine and words, denying that the Material Blood of the Beaſts, were Types of Chriſt's Material Blood, and yet Fallaciouſly ſeem to own it*, p. 106. How does this Charge *hang together*, that I *deny* it, and *yet ſeem to own* it? If I *own* it, how am I *guilty* of a vile and groſs Error? If I ſeem to own it, ſo that he could not tell whether I own it or deny it, why would he be ſo forward to Charge me with vile and groſs Error in denying it, before he was come to a certainty that I did deny it? Does not this ſhew his *Injuſtice*, as well as his *Folly?* But beſides, both this and the Third (*viz.* That I juſtify *W. Penn*'s Doctrine, ſaying, the one Seed cannot be an outward thing; for one outward thing cannot be the proper ſign of another out-

ward

ward thing) are already diſcuſſed in this *Anſwer* to his *Narrative*, where he hath repeated theſe Charges againſt *W. Penn* and G. *Whitehead*, and *I* (as before) have endeavoured to free them from his Perverſions and Abuſes.

The Fourth Error he beſtows on me is, That I *deny that the Gift of the Divine Grace or Power within, is the real Purchaſe of Chriſt's Obedience unto Death; arguing, that if ſo, that would not be the Free Gift of God*, p. 121. Here are two notable *Pieces of Art*, he has ſhewed in the framing of this Error. Firſt, He has *changed my Words* from [*The Gift of the promiſed Seed*] to [*The Gift of the Divine Grace or Power within*:] Which quite alters the Sence of the Place. For whereas I inferred, from his Words, that the Gift of the *promiſed Seed* was not a free Gift, or did not proceed from the free Love of God to Man (contrary to *John* 3. 16.) but was the *real purchaſe* of Chriſt's moſt holy and perfect Obedience unto Death, when he came (which was the Error and Abſurdity I drew upon him from his own Words) He, to ſlip from under that, changes the Words, as I ſhewed before, from the Gift of the *promiſed Seed*, to the Gift of the *Divine Grace* and Power within, referring to *Rom.* 5. 15. *Eph.* 4. 7, 8. and *Pſalm* 68. 18. which latter Places mention Chriſt's giving Gifts unto Men, when he aſcended up on High, after his Death and Reſurrection: So turning the Free Gift of God, in *promiſing the Seed, and giving his only begotten Son*; to the Gift of Divine Grace and Power within, which Chriſt the promiſed Seed gave, when he aſcended up on high, and then charges me with Error, in denying this Gift, given by Chriſt, to be the real purchaſe of his Obedience unto Death; whereas it was the Gift *of Chriſt himſelf, as the promiſed Seed*, that I ſpake of, which was the Effect of God's free Love, not the purchaſe of Chriſt's Death. The other piece of his *Art* is, in turning this upon me, ſaying, He denies: Whereas I neither denyed, nor affirmed, but ſhewed him the Abſurdity and Error of his own Words. The

The Fifth Error he aſſigns me is, That *I blame him for ſaying Chriſt's Body is the ſame in ſubſtance it was on Earth*, p. 129. I deſire the Reader to examine that Place in my Book, and he will ſee that I do not blame *G. Keith* for ſaying Chriſt's Body is the ſame in ſubſtance it was on Earth. But I expoſe his *Confuſion* and *Folly*, in ſaying, it is the *ſame in ſubſtance* that it was on Earth, and yet ſaying, *It is no more a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but a pure, ethereal, or Heavenly Body*, as if Chriſt's Body, when on Earth, had not been a Body of Fleſh, Blood and Bones, but an Ethereal or Airy Body: Or, as if Fleſh, Blood and Bones were not of the ſubſtance of an outward, viſible, tangible Body, ſuch as was that which was nailed to the Croſs at *Jeruſalem*.

The Sixth Error he allots me is, That *I deny that Chriſt came by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary, p. 136. In this, as in the reſt, he is extreamly unjuſt. In this place alſo we treated of Chriſt, as he was *the promiſed Seed*. And he undertaking to prove (in p. 22. of his Book called *The True Copy*, &c.) from *Mat.* 1. 1. That *the Seed of Promiſe came by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary, I pinched him up cloſe with *his own words* in that ſame Book of his, p. 20. where he had ſaid, 'It is neither 'the Body of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, nor the Soul 'of Chriſt, ſtrictly conſidered, without the Godhead, 'nor the Godhead ſtrictly conſidered, without the Soul 'and Body of the Manhood of Chriſt, that is *the Seed 'of the Woman*, or Seed of *Abraham*, but *the Godhead 'and Manhood jointly conſidered*, and moſt glorioufly 'united. Hereupon I ſhewed him, that in urging *Mat.* 1. 1. to prove the Seed of Promiſe (as he had defined it) came by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*, he ſhewed himſelf to be of a *corrupt* Judgment, and *contradicted* his former Saying. I was ſo favourable before, as only to ſay, 'Should I not ſerve

'him

'him right, if from hence I ſhould conclude againſt
'him, that he holds the Seed of Promiſe, as conſiſting
'of Godhead and Manhood united, to have come by
'*Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary,
'ſince he blamed *S. C.* for denying it? But I think I have juſt cauſe now to ſet it harder on him, and *charge it home upon him*, as a *vile and groſs Error*, That he holds, that *Chriſt* (who he ſays (in the ſame place) was *the Son of God by an eternal Generation* before the World began) the promiſed Seed (which, he ſays, is *neither the Body of Chriſt*, ſtrictly conſidered, *nor the Soul of Chriſt*, ſtrictly conſidered, *without the Godhead*, nor the Godhead ſtrictly conſidered, without the Soul and Body of the Manhood of Chriſt, but the *Godhead* and *Manhood jointly conſidered*, and moſt gloriouſly united) that Chriſt, the promiſed Seed, or Seed of the Woman thus defined, *did come by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary. And I hope he will think himſelf, or that others however will think him obliged, to clear himſelf of this *Error*, which is *vile* and *groſs* enough, before he take upon him to *arraign* others.

The Seventh Error he abuſes me with is, That *I pervert the Apoſtle's Creed, in that Clauſe, Conceived of the Holy Ghoſt*, p. 138. *by which I infer, that Chriſt came not by Generation of and from the Properties of Man in* Mary; *and in ſo doing*, he ſays, *I make the Holy Ghoſt to be the material Cauſe of that Generation; as if that Holy Thing conceived, were of the ſubſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; whereas the Holy Ghoſt was the Efficient Cauſe thereof, but not the Material Cauſe.* Perverſion is ſo natural to him, that he can do nothing (at this ſort of work) without it. That he might faſten an Error upon me, he *perverts*, yea *alters* the words of that *Creed*. For the words of that Creed (in that Clauſe) are, *Conceived* **by** *the Holy Ghoſt*, (and ſo I gave them in my Book) he has changed the word **by** to **of**, and renders it, *Conceived* **of** *the Holy Ghoſt*. Whereas the word **by** imports

the

the Holy Ghoſt to have been the *Efficient* Cauſe, that by vertue of which *Mary* conceived: But the word of, imports him to have been the *Material* Cauſe, as if the thing conceived had been taken of the Matter or *ſubſtance* of the Holy Ghoſt. To avoid which I, following the *expreſs words* of that Creed, ſaid, the common *Creed*, called, *The Apoſtles*, ſays, Chriſt was conceived by the Holy Ghoſt, though born of the *Virgin Mary*. Now how *ſhameleſs* is this Man, to charge me with *vile* and *groſs* Error in *perverting the Apoſtle's Creed* in that Clauſe, *Conceived of the Holy Ghoſt*: When it plainly appears from his own Book, that it is he himſelf that has *altered*, and thereby *perverted*, the words of that Creed; and not I! Beſides, he is altogether *unjuſt* in raiſing this Cavil: for he knows that (in this Place, as well as in the other, upon which he grounded his laſt pretended Error, where I defended *S. Criſp* againſt *R. Cobbet* and him) I expreſly ſpake of Chriſt, not only with reſpect to his Body, which was born of the Virgin, but as he was *the Son of God by an Eternal Generation*, as he was conceived by the *Overſhadowing of the Power of the Higheſt*, as he was *the Promiſed Seed*, which *G. Keith* had confeſſed was *not the Manhood only*, but the *Godhead and Manhood united*: And in theſe reſpects it was that I argued, he was not produced by *Coagulation* (which was one of *Cobbet*'s Terms) nor came by Generation of and from the *Properties of Man in* Mary (which was another of *Cobbet*'s Terms.) But before I part with *G. Keith* on this Head, let us ſee whether He, who is ſo forward to brand me with this Error, has not himſelf trod too near that, which he charges me with. For in his Book called, *The way to the City of God*, p. 131. He ſays, 'Even *according to that Birth* 'He (Chriſt) was *the Son of God*, no leſs than the 'Son of Man, having God for his Father, as he had 'the Virgin *Mary* for his Mother. (But *as he was the Son of God*, having God for his Father, was he *produced*

by Coagulation. or did he come by Generation of and from *the Properties of Man in* Mary?) 'Now the Child, 'ſays he, we know, doth partake an Image or Nature 'from both Parents; and thus did Chriſt, who did 'partake of the Nature and Image of Man, from 'the Seed of *Mary*, but did partake of a Nature and 'Image much more excellent, than that of Man, in its 'greateſt glory, from God and his Seed, who did re-'ally ſow a moſt divine and heavenly *Seed* (is not that 'a *Subſtance?*) in the Virgins Womb, which as it ſup-'plied the Males Seed, ſo it had much more in it, and 'brought forth a Birth, which as it had the true and 'whole Nature of Man, ſo, I ſay, it had a Perfection 'above it, and that not only in accidental Qualities (as 'men will readily confeſs) but even in **Subſtance** and '**Eſſence.**

The Eighth Error he ſlanders me with, he calls, *my falſe way of reaſoning againſt the Man Chriſt's being created; from his reaſoning, if not created, therefore not Man; by retorting, if created, therefore not God*, p. 139. This is as meer a Cavil, as the former; and both the one and the other aroſe from hence, that he would make the *Manhood only* to be Chriſt, without the Godhead, or elſe *ſubject the Godhead to the ſame Condition of Generation*, or *Creation*, with the Manhood; either of which is an Error. This made me give him that retorting Anſwer, which has ſo much diſpleaſed him. Thus it was in my former Book. 'His Third Obſervation is 'That *S. Criſp*'s denying that Jeſus the Saviour was 'created, or calling for Scripture to prove it, doth 'ſufficiently prove, that he underſtands Chriſt only to 'be God, *and wholly excludes the Manhood* of Chriſt, 'from being Chriſt, or any part of him. Doth it ſo, 'ſaid I? Then let *G. Keith* look to himſelf. For by re-'tortion, I return upon him, That his holding that *Je-'ſus the Saviour was created* (which he doth by con-'demning *S. C.* for denying it) doth ſufficiently prove,

'that

'that he underſtands Chriſt to be *only Man*, and *wholly excludes the Godhead of Chriſt*, from being Chriſt, or 'any part of him; which to hold, is a groſs and vile 'Error. Let him acquit himſelf as he can. He cannot acquit himſelf: therefore he is angry, and *wrangles* with me for retorting this on him. He ſays, I charge him to be deeply drenched into Socinianiſm. My words are, *I confeſs, I did not think him ſo deeply drencht into Socinianiſm.* He ſays, *This is my Ignorance,* —*The Socinian Error is not, That Chriſt is a Creature, but that he is a meer Creature,* viz. *only Man,* and *not both God and Man.* I was not ignorant of this (nor am, of the folly of his Arguing,) neither can he be ignorant, that my Anſwer, by retortion, implied him to hold, that Chriſt is not only a Creature, but *a meer Creature*; only Man, wholly excluding the Godhead; which is full Socinianiſm. And until he will *leave Cavilling*, and *come down* in his Stomach, and diſtinguiſh (as he ought to do) betwixt Chriſt, as he was the Son of God by Eternal Generation, the divine Word which was in the beginning with God, and which was God; and that which he took of the Virgin; he ſhall never be able to free himſelf from the Imputation of this Error: For ſo far as he makes Chriſt to be created, ſo far he makes him a meer Creature.

The Ninth Error he aſcribes to me, he calls, *my blaming him, to make light* (ſo he expreſſes it) *of the work of Generation* (I take him to mean, Regeneration) *in compariſon of Chriſt's Incarnation*; *therefore according to him*, ſays he, *Regeneration is greater than Chriſt's Incarnation.* Upon which he crys out, *O great Blaſphemy!* p. 155. In this he miſtook me (whether ignorantly, or deſignedly, I know not:) for I did not intend (nor now do) to draw a Compariſon between thoſe two Appearances, or Manifeſtations of Chriſt, Outwardly in the Fleſh at *Jeruſalem*, and Inwardly in the Hearts of his People, ſo as to prefer the One to the Other

(for I have all along told him, I do not like to divide Christ.) But the drift and scope of my words, which here he carps at, was to shew him that he had done so. As for the Charge it self, of making Regeneration greater than Christ's Incarnation, he had charged it before (but falsly) on *W. Penn* in his *Narrative*, p. 22. And I have Answered it already in p. 82. of his Book, to which I refer the Reader for satisfaction concerning it.

His Tenth and Last Error he flings at me is, my saying that *the Author of Regeneration is Christ, chiefly, as he is manifested inwardly in the heart*, p. 152. My words (which best shew my meaning) were these. 'And very idle is he, in saying, *Seeing the Work of Regeneration and Sanctification in the Saints, is a great Mystery, must we not own him who is the Author, and great Cause of it, to be greater?* For who ever questioned that? We all own the *Workman* to be *greater* than the *Work*; the Author and great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, to be greater than the Regeneration and Sanctification wrought. And this Author and great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, we say is Christ; and that *chiefly* as he is manifested inwardly in the Heart: For he worketh it not in any, but those in whom he is so inwardly manifested. These words shew, that when I said Christ is the great Cause of Regeneration and Sanctification, *chiefly* as he is manifested inwardly in the Heart, it was with respect to him, as he is the *neareſt* and most *immediate Cause* thereof, and as he *actually* works the work of Regeneration and Sanctification in the Heart, and brings it forth. And though *G. Keith* says, *This is as absurd, as to say, The Beams of the Sun that descend on the Earth, are the chief Cause of the Earths Fruitfulness, and not the Sun it self that is in the Firmament*; yet both the *Absurdity* and *Error* will prove his own, in his comparing the Inward Appearance of Christ in the Heart (whereby the work of Regene-

generation and Sanctification is wrought) to the Beams of the Sun that is in the Firmament, by which the Earth is fructified; as if Christ were *no otherwise* in the Saints, than the Sun is on the Earth, *viz.* by its Beams. Whereas the Travail of the Apostle was, *That Christ might be formed in them he writ to*, Gal. 4. 19. That he might *dwell in their hearts* by faith, *Ephes.* 3. 17. And *G. Keith* saith expressly, *Way cast up*, p. 134. 'The word 'Incarnate, or made Flesh, and called by *James* the *In-grafted Word*, we do really see, for *it dwelleth in us.* And p. 124, 125. 'It is impossible (says *G. Keith*) that 'he could hear us, and be sensible of our Prayers, 'and especially of our Thoughts, if he were not *immediately present in us*, and with us. And in p. 123. He says, 'The Man Christ Jesus is *really present in*, and 'among us. — I do not mean, says he, by his external 'or outward Person (for that is ascended into Heaven) 'but in vertue of his divine *Life* and *Spirit*, or *Soul* extended *into us* in his divine *Seed* and *Body*, which is his 'heavenly *Flesh and Blood*, wherewith he feedeth the 'Souls of them that believe in him. In p. 107. He brings many Scriptures, (as *Joh.* 6. 56. and 17. 23. *Rom.* 8. 10. *Eph.* 3. 17. *Col.* 1. 27. 1 *Cor.* 13. 3, and 5.) to prove Christs Being and *Dwelling in the Saints*, and that as the Word made Flesh, according to *John* 1. 14. And in p. 111. Speaking of Christ's *dwelling in the hearts* of the Saints by Faith, he says, *He is formed in them.* *Gal.* 4. 19. so that *they are his Mother* who bring him forth by a spiritual and divine Birth, *Mat.* 12. 49. Is this to be compared to the Beams of the Sun that descend on the Earth ? Or did it hold forth a more *immediate*, and *substantial Indwelling* of Christ in his People? How unsuitable then is G. *Keith*'s Comparison (besides the Error it discovers in his Judgment) of the Beams of the Sun descending on the Earth, and there causing Fruitfulness in it, to Christ's working Regeneration and Sanctification in his People ? As if Christ in his Spiri-

tual Appearance and Working, were no nearer to his People, than the Sun in the Firmament is to the Earth.

What remains of his *Appendix to his Narrative*, at the bottom of p. 61, and 62. being little, and to as little purpose, I designedly wave, as supposing he may probably receive an Account of it from another hand. But I shall here fetch in a Passage in p. 60. which I purposely stept over there, with intention to bring it in here. It is this.

In p. 60. He says, *Now before I have quite done with W. Penn, let me put him in mind of his Promise, That he would answer me in the face of the Nation: For I think I have made good my Word, that I have put him to prove his Charge against me (that I am an Apostate) in the face of the Nation.* What need *W. Penn* do that, and he too. Did *W. Penn* so oblige himself to do it, that he must needs do it *over again*, after G. *Keith* hath been so kind to him to save him that labour, by having done it himself again and again, and that indeed *in the face of the Nation*, in every Book he has published since? It is probable *W. Penn* might have done it before now, if G. *Keith* had not taken the work out of his hand, and shewed himself so *officious* and forward to do it, that he has thereby rather confirmed the apprehension I formerly had of his Meaning, when in p. 32. of his Book called *The True Copy*, he said, *I propose this just demand to W. Penn, that —— he give me an Opportunity —— to make good his Charge against me*, &c. namely, That he wanted but opportunity to do it himself, and thereby free *W. Penn* from that small undertaking. I know not how I may speed for reminding him of this. For I remember he was very angry with me before, for but gently touching it (and I think pretty modestly) with a [He *seems* to have bespoke a publick Meeting, that he might have done it himself there.] Yet this *soft sough* put him into such a *Heat*, that I doubt whether he be *Cool* yet. For no longer ago than the Third Month last, when he publisht his intention of *Holding his Court* at *Turner*'s Hall, he was in such a *Fret* about it, that (in the Postscript to his Advertisement in p. 11. of his *Narrative*) he calls it, a most *impudent* and *notorious Forgery*, a *Cheat and Forgery*; Me, a *gross and impudent Forgerer*, *Wretch*

Wrester and Perverter; offers to prove me to be not only guilty of *Groſs Forgeries*, and *Perverſions*, and *Antichriſtian Principles* (which the Reader hath juſt now heard a long Liſt, in Ten Heads) and not only ſo, but (ſays he) *groſly ignorant* (in that which he pretends to have knowledge) of *Humane Learning* (and of that I can aſſure him I never pretended to much; and though I love Learning well, yet I had rather be as *Ignorant* as he takes me to be, than as *Arrogant* as I take him to be.) Neither is this all, but I am alſo, he ſays, guilty of *Pedantick Trifling* and *Quibling*, from meer Errors of the Preſs, not ſo duly corrected, yet obvious to any intelligent Reader. I confeſs, I think, both his Book and Himſelf (under correction be it ſpoken) have need enough to be *duly corrected*; and that I ſuppoſe is obvious to any intelligent Reader. Now if I did happen to miſtake his Meaning, in that *bobling* Expreſſion of his *lame* Demand, of an Opportunity for him (as his words *ſeemed* to import) to make good the Charge againſt himſelf, I think he has ſufficiently paid me off, with his *Billingſgate Rhetorick*, and *Scottiſh Complements*. Yet were it not that I am loath to offend him again ſo ſoon, I could tell him, that the Explanation he gives doth not ſufficiently clear the ſenſe of that *Cloudy* Sentence, neither hath he ſhewed that it was the Error of the Preſs, but added another, *viz. when* I will, for *where* I will. But I have done with that, leſt he tax me with Quibling. I return to p. 60. of the *Narrative*, where *G. Keith* (having put *W. Penn* in mind of his Promiſe to prove him an Apoſtate, &c. which *G. Keith* himſelf hath ſufficiently done) ſays, *And let him not put off this Work, that belongs to himſelf, to any Deputy, or Buſie Intruder*, as *T. Ellwood*, or *J. Pennington, who have already ſufficiently ſhewed their Folly in Print*. But how if *T. E.* and *J. P.* ſhould not think they have ſufficiently ſhewed their Folly in Print? Will he not give them leave to ſatisfie themſelves in that Caſe a little further? He might a little conſider us by himſelf, who hath *over-ſufficiently ſhewed his Folly in Print* long ſince, and yet *cannot refrain Scribling*, though at each time he diſcovers more Folly than before: And, but that I am doubtful it would put him into a *new Fret*, before the old one is gone off, I could ſhew him there is ſomething (even in this laſt ſentence) which, if it had not come from ſuch a *wiſe man* as he, might have been taken for a little piece of *Folly*; As where he bids *W. Penn* not put off this Work (which belongs to himſelf) to any *Deputy*, or buſie *Intruder*. Does he take the words, [*Deputy*, and *Intruder*] to be *Synonimons* Terms, I wonder? Is it proper to call him an *Intruder*, that is *Deputed*? Or him a *Deputy*, that is but an *Intruder*; and that a *buſie* one too? If not, what means he by bidding *W. Penn* not *put off* this Work to a buſie Intruder? Does not *putting off* a Work from ones ſelf to another, imply a *Deputation*? But enough of this; if not too much, for my ſtore hereafter, when he ſhall let fly at me again. He alſo reminds *W. Penn*, of [illegible]

Christian Quaker, &c. in which, he says, were, *I was not [illegible] should answer for my Faults, if any there were; and [illegible], I esteemed my self both sufficient and obliged to my own Re-*

To answer *for* faults, I confess, I think is most proper for [illegible] commits them. And if *W. Penn* had Faults to answer for, [illegible] were but before Judge *Keith*) I know not whether, as [illegible] I love him, I should be contented to take his place, or rather [illegible] with him to answer for his Faults himself. But it is one thing to answer *for* Faults; another, to answer *to* Faults objected, and [illegible] that they are *not Faults*, but *Cavils*. That *W. Penn* is *sufficient*, now, as well as he was heretofore, to his own relief, is not to be questioned. But it does not follow, that he is always, and always like, obliged to appear in his own defence; or at all, when he [illegible] no need of it, the Blow being not so strongly given, but that a [illegible] *Arm* may both bear it off, and beat it back. When an *Abler Champion* rises, (which *G. Keith* has *petitioned the Clergy for*) it [illegible] be time enough for *Abler Defendants* to come forth. In the [illegible] time, since he has accused many (and me among the rest) in [illegible] false Charge; (and that, according to the Maxim, *Frustra fit per plura, quod fieri potest per pauciora*, It is in vain to set many hands to that work, which few, or one, can do;) since also it looks like [illegible] effect of his *Pride* and *Self-conceit*, that like that *Uncircumcised Champion* of old (to whom he is not more disproportionable in Person, than in *haughtiness of Mind*, and Stomach agreeable,) despising the as *too low a Match* for him, he does, in effect, call for some *choice Man* to come out against him, as thinking me, (if made his Captive) too mean alas! to adorn his Triumph: It is but a just Retribution to him, for his (perhaps not altogether deserved) contempt of me, as well as it may serve to *abate his Pride* and Insolence; that he is fain to receive an Answer to his (in his own Opinion Unanswerable) Narrative, from the hand of one, whom he has represented so grossly ignorant, as he has done me.

Tho. Ellwood.

Advertisement.

THERE will shortly be made publick, a Book entituled, *Keith against* Keith, *or some more of* George Keith's *Contradictions Absurdities, Collected out of his own Books (not yet retracted) Review.* Together with a Reply to *G. Keith*'s late Book, *The Anabaptists and Sadducees Detected among a sort of*

By John Plumstead.